

**Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020**

Page 1 of 15

Regular Session Meeting of the Sandy Springs City Council was held on Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 7:34 p.m., Mayor Rusty Paul presiding.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Rusty Paul called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL AND GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Interim City Clerk Lia Jones made the general announcements and called the roll.

Mayor Rusty Paul – present.

Council Members present: Council Member John Paulson, Council Member Steve Soteres, Council Member Chris Burnett, Council Member Jody Reichel, Council Member Tibby DeJulio and Council Member Andy Bauman.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Mayor Paul led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were six (6) public comment cards received for this Tuesday, October 20, 2020, meeting; all public comments are made a part of the official meeting record.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion and Vote: Council Member DeJulio moved that the meeting agenda be approved for Tuesday, October 20, 2020. Council Member Soteres seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. **2020-248** October 6, 2020 City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
- B. **2020-249** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of A Resolution to Amend the Adopted 2021 Board of Appeals Hearing Schedule

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-119

- C. **2020-250** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of a Real Estate Agreement for the Purchase of a Permanent Drainage Easement for the Stormwater Project at 6170 River Shore Parkway

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-120

Motion and Vote: Council Member Bauman moved that the consent agenda be adopted and approved for Tuesday, October 20, 2020. Council Member Burnett seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. PRESENTATIONS

- A. **2020-251** PCID Update

Mr. Patrick Chesser, Fulton County PCID (Perimeter Community Improvement Districts) presented PCID Updates:

Top End 285 Transit Study, Phase III

Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020
Page 2 of 15

- PCID Funding \$29,773 for Next Phase of Study for Bus Rapid Transit in Top End Managed Lanes (in conjunction with Sandy Springs and all 6 other cities, 3 Other CIDS, 4 CIDS, MARTA, Atlanta & GDOT)
- Further Concept Work for Rapid Transit Station at Perimeter Center Parkway Managed Lane Interchange (Adjacent To State Farm)

Top End 285 Managed Lane Coordination

- Coordination on aesthetics of new interchanges and bridge structures at Ashford Dunwoody Road and Perimeter Center Parkway in the Top End Managed Lane Project.

Ashford Dunwoody Corridor Project

- Trail and Corridor Project along Ashford Dunwoody Road, inside of 285 (From Montgomery Elementary School to 285)
- Design Funded 100% by DeKalb PCID in Partnership with the City of Brookhaven.

Ashford Dunwoody Trail Project, Phases I and II

- Trail Project along Ashford Dunwoody Road, North of 285 adjacent to Perimeter Mall up to Mt. Vernon Road.
- Design and Construction funded in a 50/50 Partnership with the City of Dunwoody and DeKalb PCID.

Intersection Projects (within City of Dunwoody & Brookhaven, designs funded 100% by DeKalb PCID)

- Perimeter Summit Boulevard at Ashford Dunwoody Road (adjacent to Perimeter Summit)
- Perimeter Center Parkway at Perimeter Center West (near Target Development)
- Ashford Center Parkway at Perimeter Center West (near Joey D's Restaurant)

Mt Vernon Trail Project

- Continued coordination between PCID Staff and City Staff to Develop a Partnership Framework for City's Existing Trail Project along Mount Vernon Road.

Sandy Springs Transportation Improvements – Mt. Vernon Hwy. Multimodal Improvement

- PCID looks forward to working in conjunction and coordination with the City of Sandy Springs in this project and offers to help in a meaningful way or fund in a meaningful way, of an on-going project, map taken from SandySpringsga.gov which shows parts of the trail – within the PCID jurisdiction right about Barfield Road. We have Ann Hanlon, our Director and John Grubal, our engineer, working in collaboratively with the City of Sandy Springs.

Mayor Rusty Paul stated that it was a great report on things going on in Dunwoody and Brookhaven but what about Sandy Springs. We are spending a lot to beautify bridges in Sandy Springs, and you are spending a lot to beautify bridges in Dunwoody and Brookhaven. What about getting some help for the beautification of the bridges in Sandy Springs. We have Hammond and Mt. Vernon Highway.

Mr. Chesser referred to the last bullet point. What we would like to do is to begin that relationship with a project that you already have on your books. PCID would like to cooperate with the City, assuming the City wants its cooperation. It sounds like an initiative worth pursuing. He has not seen an initiative or design to do that but it is not to say we cannot begin one. John Grubal or Ann Hanlon can please speak to that point.

Ann Hanlon, Director of PCID addressed the question. She knew that the City of Sandy Springs is pursuing bridge aesthetics improvements on the GA 400 Project. They are all outside of the CID boundary, it comes down to the Northbound MARTA station and that it too far north of our boundary.

John Grubal, Engineer, PCID added with the Top End 285 Project, which is a little ways away, they are going to be including a new Managed Lane Interchange at Mt. Vernon, and that would be a really good project to get an early start and coordination to see how that could be creatively advanced into an aesthetic project. Another one that is under construction right now is the Abernathy at SR 400 DDI. There will be extra structures, as you know GA 400 crosses over and part of that project will have to be coordinated with the future GA 400 MMIP Project that GDOT is doing. That would be another good structure. Those are just a couple that are done with GDOT that could be potential new projects, too.

Mayor Paul thanked everyone very much and stated that the City would like to hear regularly from the PCID. It is an important partner for us on transportation, as we are working together on improving our transportation, and we need a little bit more communication between PCID and Council. He would like to make this a regular feature, where we get regular presentations on what is going on with PCID.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. 2020-252** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of U20-0001 (201 Mount Vernon Highway, 0 Mount Vernon Highway (Parcel #17 0123 LL1187), & 0 Mount Vernon Highway NE (Parcel #17 0089 LL0116)) Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Modify Previous Conditions from ZM11-005/CV11-007

Alexandra Horst, Planner II, Community Development presented Conditional Use Permit Case NO. U20-0001 is for Arlington Cemetery at 201 and 0 Mt. Vernon Highway, and 0 Mt. Vernon Highway NE. Staff recommends conditional approval and Planning Commission deferred and then recommended approval with staff's recommended conditions and additional conditions. The request is for a Conditional Use Permit to modify the previous conditions from Zoning Modification Case ZM11-0005. The 3 parcels of Arlington were zoned AG-1 under the old zoning ordinance; they are not CON (Conservation) and the access parcel is RD-27. Cemetery / Mausoleum use is permitted in CON with a Condition Use Permit. The applicant's specific request are to revised the previously approved site plan; remove 7 previously proposed and approved mausoleum building; remove the time frame restriction on the construction of 3 mausoleums; and, proceed with construction of proposed mausoleum building A, which was previously proposed and approved. On the site plan, the red rectangles in the northern and southwestern portions of Arlington are previously approved mausoleums that are being eliminated. Proposed Mausoleum A is the brown rectangle in the southwest by the existing office shown with diagonal lines. As mentioned, most of Arlington is zoned CON and in the Conservation Areas/Parks Character Area. Between the Conditional Use Permit and Cemetery Mausoleum Use Standard Considerations, no buildings are proposed within 100' of a protected neighborhood; no above ground monuments nor parking areas are proposed within 50' of a property line or protected neighborhood; and, no structures are proposed in the 10' structure in earth interments setback. The proposed lot coverage is only 11.82% and there is a 25' undisturbed natural vegetative buffer along the side and rear lots lines. The Planning Commission recommended approval with Staff's recommended conditions, adding an additional condition about plantings to screen the proposed new maintenance building and Mausoleum Building I, in the northernmost portion of the site. As the request is to modify previous conditions from ZM11-005, Staff recommends that previous conditions that remain relevant be carried over and revised as necessary.

Carl Westmoreland, 3343 Peachtree Road, representing Chad Eubanks with Arlington and Kalyn Kenney, who is their engineer and who is here tonight if you have questions. Ms. Horst did a very good job of explaining the situation. You are all familiar with Arlington; it is 122 acres and has been here since the 1920's. This process began last fall when we came in to request a change of a condition about timing on mausoleums, only to find out that you had zoned it CON (Conservation) which did not allow cemeteries. You had a Text Amendment to allow cemeteries with Use Permit within this district, and January, we subsequently filed and have been held up a bit by the pause and public hearings. As she said, this really carrier over the existing conditions other than it eliminates 7 mausoleum buildings that were approved by Council in 2012. This does not increase the size of the cemetery or decrease any buffers; it will allow Arlington to begin construction of a new mausoleum, next year and it is near the office, in the interior of the cemetery. This will be the first that has been built since 2008. Between 2012 and now, Fulton County went in and rebuilt the two detention ponds. We spent most of our time with the neighbors trying to come up with a plan to replant areas that Fulton County had destroyed. We amended the application with plans that do that; the other change we made was to reduce the heights of any proposed mausoleums from 35', essentially the size of a single-family house, to 25'. Again, nothing moved closer to the property line; seven of them were eliminated and the height was reduced. We agree with the staff conditions, including the one mentioned being added by the Planning Commission. There was discussion about additional screenings specific to homes on the north end, near the north detention pond. What we have agreed to do is at least one year prior to the beginning of construction on either of the buildings closest to that subdivision, we would come to the City and submit a landscape plan with evergreens and have that installed a year before construction can begin. The timeline on this is uncertain; the building that would begin next year would be the first one built since 2008; this is not something that is imminent.

Kalyn Kenney, Prime Engineering, 6465 Scott Valley Road, Sandy Springs GA 30328 – reserved her time for questions after opposition.

Rhonda Smith, 76 Long Island Pl, 76 Long Island Pl, Sandy springs, GA, 30328 – speaking as President, Mountaire Springs Neighborhood Association, which includes the 7 homes of the Enclave at Long Island, which is adjacent to Arlington Cemetery along the north property line. We absolutely appreciate the time and consideration that the cemetery has given to those materially affected homeowners. As, Mr. Manne, who is one of the two adjacent residents will articulate in his comments, there is a significant difference in topography sloping down from the residential side of the line looking south to the proposed building sites on the updated plan. He has opted to speak during the opposition's time to allow for adequate time for his comments. The updated plan calls for the existing maintenance building to be rebuilt in a new location that will require tree removal in that new location and place in line of sight for the homeowners. It is currently partially in their line of sight, particularly during the fall and winter months and early spring when all the leaves are off the trees. In place of that existing building, a taller and larger mausoleum building will eventually be built. As a planned larger structure, the mausoleum will require some tree removal and again, be in view from Long Island Drive homeowner's vantage points for most of the year. We do appreciate the reduction in height that obviously will change their point of view with the 10' reduction but still they will have it in their line of sight. While the timeline for these construction activities is not defined, the affected homeowners feel they must prepare for the eventuality of the changing building landscape as if it were being built tomorrow. The additional condition proposed during the Planning Commission approval provides some relief; however, it is hoped you will consider strengthening this condition by requiring a more advanced timeline for plantings that will allow the required plantings to mature for a longer period prior to construction and provide a more defined standard for plantings. In the statement in the additional condition, the Planning Commission proposed, as approved by the City Arborist, is this a defined standard in the code and, what is that standard? The more in advance of construction any planting agreed upon can be made, the more it will ensure a more adequate screening of the future proposed buildings from the line of sight of the north adjacent property owners.

David Manne, 6324 Long Island Drive, and Sandy Springs GA 30328 – My property borders the most northern edge of the cemetery. I am here tonight on behalf of my family and the seven property owners of the Enclave at Long Island. While in general we are in support of the applicant's plan to modify their zoning conditions, and appreciate the additional condition recommended by the Planning Commission, we do not believe it goes far enough to protect the neighborhood. If you refer to page 64 of the package, you will see along the most northern edge a proposed 25' vegetation buffer. While this looks great on paper, the truth is they've presented you with the visual of a tree buffer that they cannot plant based on the sanitary sewer easement that falls within that proposed buffer, as reflected on page 67. While we understand that the buffer falls within the detention basin and they are prohibited from having rooted plantings in the area, we do not believe that should excuse them from having to plant the buffer to provide the line of sight screenings as required on all other sections of the property that border the neighborhood. We believe that they should be responsible for planting the tree buffer on their property in an area that will give us a line of sight buffer between our neighborhood and their business. On page 67, you will also see a tree plan that shows a number of trees currently planted on the north border of the detention basin that would give the appearance that the tree buffer of sorts has already been installed. But, those trees are on property owned by myself and my neighbors and were planted by Fulton County unrelated with anything to do with the cemetery. They have no responsibility to upkeep those plantings and in my opinion, they should not even be reflected on their plans as they give a false indication of what has already been done and should not be taken into consideration for anything they are requesting or proposing. Additionally, on page 54, photo 32, there is a photo that shows what it looks like from our vantage point. While this photo does not take into account any topography, or the fact that it was taken when all trees were in full bloom, it is not what we look at over most of the year. Throughout the fall, winter and early spring, our view is of soil piles of dirt that grows from time to time; heavy equipment rolling by to maintain the grounds; and, the current maintenance building. Through the few remaining trees, which will most likely torn down to accommodate the footprint of the new mausoleum, they will be closer to the property line than the current maintenance building. We acknowledge the change in topography, which creates challenges for completely screening our view, but that is why we think it is even more imperative for the plantings to be completed sooner rather than waiting until 12 months prior to any construction along the north border. While to the naked eye, the topography can make it look tough to create a buffer, I recently had a survey completed of my home and from the main level of my house, down to the bottom of my yard, is a change of about 16-18' and then increases as you go back up to the cemetery, creating a true change of topography of close

Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020
Page 5 of 15

to 10'. Finally, on page 66 of the package, there is the approved plan from 2012, which shows a similar vegetation buffer that was to be planted. If you look at the very northeast corner today, that corner is 6304 Long Island and the Mountaire Pool; you will see that that buffer does not exist today. This is why we are asking for a timeframe that will require them to plant the buffer at some point versus keeping it open ended. While we are appreciative of the additional condition recommended by the Planning Commission, we do not believe it goes far enough to protect the neighborhood and additional language should be included to require the appropriate amount of plantings and for the work to be completed sooner rather than later, regardless of when the new buildings will be constructed, as an 8' tree does not do a lot to block a 25' tall building. We greatly value the services that Arlington creates for our community but let's not forget that they are a for-profit business that is actually publicly traded. We do not feel it is unreasonable for them to be required to plant and maintain a tree buffer along the northern border to protect our neighborhood, just as they are required to do everywhere else on the property.

Carl Westmoreland, rebuttal – As the staff can tell you that we have gone above and beyond in trying to address the comments that we heard, including, trying to make up for some of what the county did when they went in and worked on the two detention ponds. We thought that leaving the details of the planting to the City Arborist was certainly fair. It is not that the case that none of this planting has to be done until the buildings are built. In fact, all of the planting that we submitted with the plan to the staff has to be done, and is tied to the issuance of the next building permit, which would be sometime next year. All we're talking about in terms of planting that is not required to be done now, is additional plan and if, one of these other buildings is built. Nothing has changed in the view that Mr. Manne has since he bought his house. He is 280' from the existing maintenance building and would be, we have calculated, about 400' from the proposed new maintenance building; and 250' from the proposed mausoleum. Again, this is not as if he has a house backing up next to him. The uncertainty of when these would be built, we think makes it fair to say that we would come to the City. We cannot get a building permit until the City has approved a screening plan along either of these two buildings, the proposed mausoleum or the proposed new maintenance building. We think that is fair and to go out and plant now, when there is no plan to build the buildings, is unreasonable, given everything else that we have committed too. Again, this is a better plan for all the neighbors given the fact that it is removing 7 buildings that are approved today and adds a lot of additional plantings. We think the Planning Commission condition that was added is fair and ask you to approve it as recommended by the staff with that condition.

City Attorney Dan Lee asked if he addressed the issue of the proposed conditions set by the staff and the Planning Commission for the buffer would interfere with a sanitary sewer line that it out there. The county, we know because the City was involved with a lawsuit with the county, has many easements out there. The sanitary sewer line, first does it appear on the drawings submitted to the Planning Commission? The condition by the Planning Commission, you are stating that it does not interfere with the sewer line.

Mr. Westmoreland replied that he believes the drawing submitted contained the location of the sanitary sewer line and I think that is what we have done. As you have heard, we cannot plant in the detention ponds obviously. We are also staying away from the sanitary sewer line; we understand we cannot plant in those lines. There is a line down the western boundary, I think, that we have to stay out of and that area until cleared. That runs behind a lot of houses that are, I cannot recall the name of the street, but we've tried where the county cleared that out for the sewer line is where we have tried to address it. We are not planting back in those areas. The condition that the Planning Commission recommended to do the additional screening planting for the two buildings does not interfere with the sewer line at all.

Mayor Rusty Paul asked if the new building already been designed? Do you have architectural plans for that? Therefore, if you were to plant a buffer today and you designed a building to fit on that site, would the construction interfere with the critical root zone of the buffer. Would that be an issue? Therefore, you do not know what the building is going to look like. How it is going to exactly fit into that particular parcel.

Mr. Westmoreland – we have not designed either of these buildings today; we have limited the height to say that it cannot be greater than 25. He suspected it would be; what they would do in working with the City staff, if we have to do planting before we begin construction is coordinate the construction plan with where we put the plantings. However, those are not designed yet. We have general location shown on the plan; we have committed to limit the height and not have interior lighting, for example, but beyond that, no.

Council Member Burnett asked Ms. Horst, regarding future approval, when the building plans are submitted ultimately for the mausoleum construction, is the City's code specific about the number of trees and the placement of those trees. He believes Mr. Manne's concern is about the view from the site of the mausoleum towards his neighborhood. There would be trees planted along that side. Is it strongly defined in our Codes about the number of trees or the distances of the trees between each other? He knows that the building size could vary and would that variance in building size drive the number of trees that are ultimately planted there? Therefore, when the cemetery got ready to submit their plans, let us say they were going to do plantings 12-18 months in advance of building the building; they would have to bring the plans in at that time that far ahead of schedule and then the City would establish for them the planting requirements based on their proposed building. My understanding is that shorter trees actually have a better chance of surviving than taller trees; he believes our Code requires 6' height, but the cemetery has agreed to 8' height? Is that correct? Would an extra six (6) months for 18 months in advance. Instead of 12 how helpful is that to the root balls being able to take hold within the soil. You do worry about, particularly with topography challenges, when construction begins would it be better for the survivability of those trees to be in the ground 1.5 years versus 12 months.

Ms. Horst stated to her knowledge, the City Arborist goes through a very detailed review of the requirements of Division 8.2 about Landscaping and Screening, as well as the Tree Ordinance to ensure that the appropriate and required number of trees planted in the appropriate places and all of that satisfies the requirement of the code. To her understanding, the answer is yes. Part of the Planning Commission added condition the applicant would have to submit a Screening Plan to staff at least one year prior to the beginning of construction. Then the Arborist would need to make sure to review what that plan for the Code and approve that then those plantings would be installed. All of that, at least one year prior. The condition reads, Plantings at a minimum installed height of 8' on the north side of those referenced buildings. There is a minimum height for those installed trees; then, there are also requirements that the Arborist ensures compliance with about a certain number of trees planted in a certain way that are each a certain height and size. Without being a certified Arborist, she stated that she would not have a specific answer to the question about survivability 18 months vs. 12 months. She referred to Ginger Sottile.

Mayor Paul interjected that because the public hearing is still open and we need to make sure that they (all parties, other than staff and City personnel) are finished before closing the public hearing; then we can engage in more discussion between staff and Council. Mayor Paul closed the Public Hearing.

Council Member DeJulio – had one question of Mr. Westmoreland. We are talking about 12 months in advance, we are talking about no architectural drawings; when do they plan to put in this mausoleum? Is this something in the next year or two? They put the last one in in 2008; are they getting ready to redo these now? Are we talking about 5-10 years from now? We are not talking about the one down where they are building; we are talking about the one by their homes. Therefore, the next one in line is the one down by their offices and that will probably be in the next year or two. So, they are doing one before the one being built near their homes, so we are talking about a couple of years out?

Mr. Westmoreland as I said the plan for next year would be down by the office. It has been 13 years since the previous building was built. Unless COVID gets a lot worse, I cannot imagine that it would be much quicker than that. The one closest to their homes is not even the next one in line. He responded probably beginning construction next year. Again, that would depend on demand. The last mausoleum was built in 2008; the next one is probably 13 years later, it is going to be a while. We would be agreeable to that.

Council Member Burnett asked if he knew what the total numbers of crypts would be in the new mausoleum proposed to be built. In the event that our Arborist did determine that there was benefit to planting say 18 months prior versus 12 months, that it would create a great probability of the tree survivability during construction, (addressing Arlington Cemetery representatives), would you all be agreeable to that is the Arborist feels like that is a better route to go?

Mr. Chad Eubanks, Arlington Cemetery responded that the new mausoleum would contain around 500 full crypts, and now more families geared towards cremations, so probably about 900 cremations spaces is usually the average.

Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020
Page 7 of 15

Council Member Bauman asked if there was an ongoing maintenance requirement here. Do they have to installed them and then maintain them? Therefore, if there is an issue is not this air tight enough that they have to come back and maintain and/or replaced a tree / bush if it fails to survive.

Mayor Paul stated that they have to maintain the buffers if there is any significant issues. The buffer would have to be replaced.

City Attorney Lee stated that we have an intricate Tree Ordinance, even though it does give the Arborist some leeway, I think Ginger Sottile could shed some light on the subject

Assistant City Manager Smith stated that that she was looking at the Code and felt that would be most helpful. We talking about maintaining the landscaping, the Code requires

Sec. 8.2.8. D. Maintenance of Landscaping

1. The property owner is responsible for maintaining all required landscaping and screening in good health and condition.
2. Any dead, unhealthy, damaged or missing landscaping and screening must be replaced with landscaping and screening that conforms to this Division within 90 days (or within 180 days where weather concerns would jeopardize the health of plant materials).

Therefore, it would have to be replaced.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Burnett moved to approve Agenda item 2020-252, Consideration of U20-0001 (201 Mount Vernon Highway, 0 Mount Vernon Highway (Parcel #17 0123 LL1187), & 0 Mount Vernon Highway NE (Parcel #17 0089 LL0116)) Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Modify Previous Conditions from ZM11-005/CV11-007. Council Member Reichel seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-10-20

- B. 2020-253** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of Adoption of the Annual Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Update

Matthew Anspach, Senior Planner, Community Development presented that what you have before you is the Adoption of the Annual Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Update for the year 2020-2021. The Annual Financial Report has been adjusted to reflect the 2020-2021 beginning balances, impact fees collected and accrued interest for each public facility type. The draft has been reviewed by the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). Both agencies have found the City of Sandy Springs has adequately addressed applicable requirements. Staff recommends approval of the year's update.

No public comments; public hearing closed by **Mayor Paul**.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Paulson moved to approve Agenda item 2020-253, Consideration of Adoption of the Annual Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Update. Council Member Soteres seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Council Member Paulson as if there were any comments received from either ARC or DCA. The response was negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-121

- C. 2020-254** ABL_72311 - Approval of Alcoholic Beverage License Application for 6125 Roswell Rd LLC, DBA C&S Seafood & Oyster Bar at 6125 Roswell Road Suite 700, Sandy Springs, GA 30328. Applicant is Jonathan Schwenk for Consumption on the Premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits.

Toni Carlisle, Assistant Finance Director presented the new application for consumption on the premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits. Business is located between Hilderbrand Drive and Denmark Drive. Applicant submitted a completed application on August 31, 2020. Applicant has passed the background investigation. This business is located in District 3.

No public comments; public hearing closed by **Mayor Paul**.

Council Member Bauman stated that they do not do many endorsements but that he had been in this establishment a few times and it is outstanding.

Mayor Paul stated that they had gone a couple of weeks ago and it was very enjoyable. He further said that they sat outside and enjoyed the low flow of traffic.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Burnett moved to approve Agenda item 2020-254, Approval of Alcoholic Beverage License Application for 6125 Roswell Rd LLC, DBA C&S Seafood & Oyster Bar at 6125 Roswell Road Suite 700, Sandy Springs, GA 30328. Applicant is Jonathan Schwenk for Consumption on the Premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits. Council Member Soteris seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- D. 2020-255** ABL_72317 - Approval of Alcoholic Beverage License Application for Successmok, LLC DBA One Sushi at 6115 Peachtree Dunwoody Road Suite K120, Sandy Springs, GA 30328. Applicant is Yeon Mok for Consumption on the Premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits.

Toni Carlisle, Assistant Finance Director presented a change of ownership for consumption on the premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits. Business is located between Central Park Drive and Hammond Drive NE. Applicant submitted a completed application on August 31, 2020. Applicant has passed the background investigation. This business is located in District 3.

No public comments; public hearing closed by **Mayor Paul**.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Burnett moved to approve Agenda item 2020-255, Approval of Alcoholic Beverage License Application for Successmok, LLC DBA One Sushi at 6115 Peachtree Dunwoody Road, Suite K120, Sandy Springs, GA 30328. Applicant is Yeon Mok for Consumption on the Premises Wine, Malt Beverages, and Distilled Spirits. Council Member Reichel seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. 2020-256** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of a Resolution to Approve and Adopt Certain Financial Policies for the City of Sandy Springs

Andrea Surratt, City Manager stated that you have before you tonight, five (5) policies that the City would like to amend, update, or adopt new. We have talked about these as they relate to the Bond Sales that we have done in the last few weeks in particular when we went before Standard & Poor's and Moody's, it was called out that it was important to have the most financial policies in place. Tonight, we can discuss questions you might have, but the five include Cash and Investment Management Policy, which covers wise investments and giving parameters to do such. Debt Management Policy also refers back to our City Charter, which identifies the threshold for the debt that we have. Fund Balance Policy similarly refers back to the City Charter. Post-Issuance Compliance and Continuing Disclosure Policy is a new policy for us because now we have the debt that we have; this gives us a 'working' set of tasks to do to maintain compliance with the Securities & Exchange Commission (SEC). Finally, the Purchasing Policy we have had this in the past, this updates it and brings it into the latest standard. If you have specific questions, Courtney Rogers, Davenport & Company, LLC, is on the line if you have specific questions.

Council Member Bauman stated that he did read the 76 pages; he had some questions for Mr. Rogers with Davenport & Company. As it relates to Capital Assets for which we have debt, the Bond debt, is it required or desirable that we

actually have a policy as it relates to sinking funds to account for depreciation and Capital Asset Reserves. Then to Mrs. Surratt, as well. First, required, second, desirable?

Courtney Rogers, Davenport & Company, stated that it is not something that is required or even asked about. My guess is that with local governments, especially when it comes to general projects such as what we just borrowed for; typically, it is something that is taken care of in a CIP down the road. Sometimes with utility systems, you might see this type of policy. Or what we call a Repair or Replacement Fund, not typically for normal government assets.

Council Member Bauman said that so since we are talking about financial policies that the Council adopts, and we have a very strong City Manager / Council system of government, would it be desirable? I am not suggesting an amendment tonight. Do we want to consider that we have a Reserve Policy, a General Reserve Policy, is that something that we ought to be considering as it relates to our Capital Assets; a Replacements Fund or, because some stuff is not done annually a significant amount is. I am just throwing this out there, Council has a lot of experience with these issues as well, should we thinking about, we have relatively new assets but for the first time in the City's history, we have significant capital assets. Just wondering what prudence would suggest, but he is just raising the question. So it sounds like it is going to be good financial practice, I guess my question for the rest of the Council and Mayor is whether it would be good financial policy.

City Manager Surratt stated that her opinion on this is that we absolutely need a CIP that identifies assets and plans for their maintenance and long-term care for at least 5 years. If it is not something that Council needs to adopt in the Annual Budget, it is certainly a product of the Finance Department and the City Manager's Office to have on hand and look at every year that we do the budget. Therefore, we are already going to begin that process this year, just informally identifying all of our assets, not whether these are buildings. Of course, CIP projects fall into that whether it even vehicles. We have to begin managing the long-term care and do it in increments because now we have more money tied up in debt payments, so we do not have as much flexibility. I think that Courtney answered it is desirable. No, we did not do a CIP Policy.

Mr. Rogers, Davenport & Company asked if there is a CIP Policy. That may be something we can bring back in the future. Something that relates to Capital Assets and Capital Planning; we can help you with that.

Council Member Paulson said he has a question in general. We have owned buildings since we have become a City, between fire stations and other things. What have we done with regard to this topic of setting funds aside and putting money aside for whatever improvements they need.

City Manager Surratt stated that we have had buildings that we have leased to a great degree throughout the years. We have had fire stations, in particular that were inherited. So, most of our capital planning has just been able to be in a lump sum amount for department. If it were fire stations that need repair? We did some of those things along the way. Frankly, it is a benefit to have sound resources available. We have not had to go and choose the one project over the other; we have been able to fund the things that we needed over time. Now, we have enough things that are new and need to be maintained, that we need a system.

Council Member Bauman stated that we have a pay-as-you-go system but there have been ties. We have had the ability to take care of it like that. An emergency generator came up, a new roof; and I think we have to be careful because this is really a cash management policy. It is prudent at some point to think about certain systems that will have a useful life and preparing for that and not wanting to pay for those over 1 fiscal year but maybe over time. I will continue and this is in no particular order, and I know we had a briefing and I am trying to consolidate the questions. There are references to Finance Director and Investment Officer in various documents is that position different? Who are those people right now? What happens when those positions are vacant? Therefore, the Finance Director is the CFO position. In addition, a Chief Investment Officer or Investment Officer... When that position is not filled, I do not as a policy maker, while many duties may fall to a temporary position, I know those positions are not Council approved, but the default should be policy wise, to at the very least the City Manager. Therefore, I think the answer to my question is that they would be same person. There are exceptions within the Purchasing Policy to, when certain thresholds are met when you do not need to go and do RFP's, bidding and otherwise, and they all seem to make sense to me. We have situations come up also when they are incremental. I know you come back on Change Orders, maybe it is a large contract and there is a Change Order and there are time you come back and times you may

not. Is there anything in the Policy or the City's practice right now, that when under the policies, pages 26 of 76, where you keep a log either for reporting back to, at some point to the Council, to the Mayor, which I'd be fine with, where when you are doing things by exception. I'm not suggesting paper clips, and other things like that, if there are certain professional services, certain legal services, to what extent do these policies mandate that you come back to the Council. Is that by practice or policy? Therefore, there are stated exceptions to that. If you refer to page 26 under Purchasing Thresholds. There again by policy, thresholds for items purchased between \$5K and \$99K, and purchases over \$99K. Then Section D describes exceptions to B and C above, for example, a good available only from one source or supply. Certain purchased with the US; skipping down, for example, Legal Services, litigation, and legal expenses would be carved out and they would not have to come. He does not think, before the Council. He understands that anything is being we have a new City Manager and we are going to have a new Finance Director. What I am suggesting is a practice of retaining, when if by exception, you are doing something that it not otherwise coming to the Council, based on permission in the policy, that you retain a log of those items. You maintain a General Ledger. In addition, he was not looking for an open track book at this point. He thinks the other checks and balances we do get decent monthly financial statements. Just wanted to raise that. Two other topics here. As part of our Investment Policy, and the Mayor and I spoke about this not too long ago, was whether state law has in any way changed that would permit us to make, as a City, other than through the Georgia One Fund, direct foreign investment purchases. Specifically, for example, Israel bonds, which might otherwise meet every single of the prudent investment criteria; he's not suggesting there would be any sacrifice of investment standards, but do we know and he would like to request that we look into whether that would be a permitted investment. I know our Investment Policy has general language about what state law permits but it does not specially call it out. I am even sure state law allows it.

City Manager Surratt stated that Finance Director is a department head position and Investment Officer that could be the same person or designee, but it is related. Yes, and I am doing some of those duties right now in that regard. She replied that her threshold is \$99,000. She brings everything to the body that is over that amount for approval. This is according to the current standards. This should be in our Charter, it is also in the Purchase Policy and part of the statutes.

Mayor Paul stated that it was a policy that we passed.

City Attorney Lee stated that the Legal Department has answered this before. That if the amendment to a contract takes the purchase over the threshold, even back in the previous threshold amount, if it is a legal opinion that it exceeds the amount. You have a contract that was under the amount, i.e., \$80K, and a Change Order came in that was \$25K, it exceeds the amount and has to come before Council. His response was he felt that there were two different issues discussed. Many places retain a log of all purchases. Even a log of all purchases, all procurement and all satisfied contracts, they maintain a log so that the staff, the City Manager, and then the Council can see what is being purchased below the threshold that must be brought to them. Then, you have ongoing purchases, we will use legal fees as an example, that it is an ongoing cost, monthly; otherwise, electricity may be one. It could be ongoing costs are covered in the budget, authorized by the Council. In addition, that is the coverage and that is the endorsement by the Council needed in those situations. The Purchasing Policy in front of you has to do with outright procurement for individual or one-incident purchases. If something is added, that would take it over the threshold, it must be brought before Council. Their idea of a log is not unheard of. He deferred to Courtney Rogers on the question of for example, Israel bonds.

Courtney Rogers stated that he was just making some notes on that. He knows that we have looked at that in the past; he does not know where it stands from your Georgia statute. We are happy to look into that for the City.

Council Member Bauman stated that he knew about the Georgia One Fund, but he knows that the State of Georgia itself has been able to purchase, for its money management, foreign bonds. It has, in fact, purchase Israel bonds; some of those are liquidating right now. Nonetheless, he would request a second look. His final question to the City Manager and City Attorney. He noticed and it came as a surprise that we have a Non-Discrimination Policy. This document references both the current state of the law at the Federal level but then it goes regarding Title VI Purchasing Policy to state a Sandy Springs policy, which maybe we apparently adopted in 2018 as it related to a Purchasing Policy. What surprised me was that that policy does not match what he understood our overall general policy, which is broader than the Federal standards as it relates to hiring and for use of facilities, a broader definition. He does not attribute it to anything other than we have been doing it. He does not want to offer an Amendment tonight, but that

we come back to the Council with a review of our Non-Discrimination Policies, and either an explanation as to why we would have different policies for different situations or a recommendation that we adopt a universal policy. That would be the general rule and then if there was exceptions that needed to be made to that, that those would be brought up overtly, so that we would have the rule of thumb and then if there were exceptions, then we would consider exceptions. He would note for the body that this Non-Discrimination Policy does not match our expanded policy that we have on our website and that we have as a Council, previously adopted as recently as 2016. In addition, we have had that, when he thinks about partnership agreements, whether it be with Morgan Falls Athletics and others, it is not just an Employment; he was under the impression that it was in everything. Again, his request would be that we would have it in everything, unless there was an exception and a reason for the exception. He stated he could remember that this came up in 2014, early when he began on Council it was a topic of discussion. In fact, with the Morgan Falls Partnership Agreement. This is making the point, is that it sounds like we have a gap between what he or others in the community might understand our policies, and perhaps even members of Council, and what in fact, our practice is. He would simply request a review of our Non-Discrimination policies and that we look to, as much as we possibly can, apply them consistently across our platforms. My understanding, for sure, was an employment use of facilities, City programming, for example, if we offer programming through gymnastics, or other things, that we have that. He does not think that it was by chance when the partners put it in the contract. He feels that we have been putting in. We do not do a lot of contract where our partners issue the contract; we typically issue the contract.

City Attorney Lee said that he could speak to that; Council Member Bauman is correct that the Employment Discrimination Policy, which exceeds that of the state and federal government, was evidently adopted by Mayor and Council some time ago and it does include matters of discrimination that the Procurement Policy does not cover. Our Procurement Policy as expanded is also greater than the state and federal even though it does not rise or does not include those groups or some of the groups that are included in the Employment Policy. The three allowed by state/federal are age, race, and national origin. It is not a requirement in all the contracts, nor is it a requirement in the Procurement Policy. What you have before you tonight is just a continuation of what you have approved in previous years. If you want to expand that, then that is obviously something the Council would have to do. He would submit that the policies you have right now are existing because they have been adopted in the past. The Employment Policy, the ones you are referring to, some of the contractors have an expanded coverage in their contract, and that is why it appears there.

Mayor Paul asked that staff take these under advisement and bring them back to the Mayor and City Council.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Reichel moved to approve Agenda item 2020-256, Approve and Adopt Certain Financial Policies for the City of Sandy Springs. Council Member Paulson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-122

- B. 2020-257** Mayor and City Council Consideration of a Supplemental Bond Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Revenue Bonds Series 2020B; the Execution of a Lease Agreement; the Issuance and Delivery of the Bonds; and Other Purposes

City Manager Andrea Surratt this is the resolution that the City Council would consider, you considered it sitting as the PFA earlier, and it is for monies for repurposing the recently purchased building for the Public Safety Headquarters, two fire stations and other public safety needs. This is the final Supplemental Resolution that includes all of the information that we learned today in the bond sale.

Council Member DeJulio asked a question of the City Attorney, since this covers more than just the issuance of bonds, should he recuse himself, or should he vote on this.

City Attorney stated that the same rule would apply as applied earlier.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Reichel moved to approve Agenda item 2020-257, Approve and Adopt a Supplemental Bond Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Revenue Bonds Series 2020B; the Execution of a Lease

Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020
Page 12 of 15

Agreement; the Issuance and Delivery of the Bonds; and Other Purposes. Council Member Burnett seconded. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0. Council Member DeJulio having recused himself from the voting.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-127

- C. 2020-258** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of the of Acceptance of a Permanent Drainage Easement for Property Known as 821 Tanglewood Trail NW, Fulton County, Georgia, Parcel No: 170163LL0628 for the Tanglewood Stormwater Project

City Attorney Lee this is a project brought to the Legal Department for condemnation and it is a stormwater issue that is affecting the street severely and is in urgent need of repair. These are Permanent Drainage Easement and Temporary Construction Easements that are a little longer than normal because of the severe work that has to be completed in the road and to save the road and protect it from a sinkhole. The offer from the City was \$9,500.00; the homeowner unwaveringly countered with \$29,765. In an effort to settle the matter and avoid the legal expenses of the condemnation and to expedite the repair to the road, the offer from the City increased by \$5K, to \$14,500.00. This is a great savings to the City over and above the legal fees that would be incurred. We recommend that you allow us to settle this matter for the offered amount of \$14,500.00.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Bauman moved to approve Agenda item 2020-258, Approve Acceptance of a Permanent Drainage Easement for Property Known as 821 Tanglewood Trail NW, Fulton County, Georgia, Parcel No: 170163LL0628 for the Tanglewood Stormwater Project. Council Member Reichel seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-123

- D. 2020-259** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of a Resolution to Approve Submission of an Application for Funding from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources' Land and Water Conservation Fund

Michael Perry, Director of Recreation and Parks the item before you is a Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant administered by the Department of Natural Resources. We are proposing to apply for these funds for improvements to Ridgeview Park. It is to assist state and local governments with acquiring developing recreation lands, rehabilitating outdoor recreation facilities. It is approximately \$9M the state has; for this grant cycle, it requires a 50/50 match. We are going to apply for these for upgrades to Ridgeview Park, a 20-acre passive park, which currently has a playground, picnic area, and outdoor fitness / exercise equipment. Back during the times when we updated our Master Plan, this park was one of the few that we had that was rated fair. The others were good to excellent. What we are proposing specifically is to remove the outdoor fitness equipment at the park, which it outdated. This 20-25 year old equipment is wooden and rotted to the state of severe disrepair and is completely unusable. We are also proposing the installation of new Outdoor Fitness Equipment; safety surfacing; minor grading and construct concrete path to make it more ADA accessible; as well as some general landscaping and park beautifications. The estimated total for this would be \$250K maximum; this again, would be a 50/50 cost share. We would be requesting approximately \$125K for us, to be matched equally by the state. The timing of this grant, the grant is due the 31st of October; DNR plans to let us know if we are moved on to a finalists list, which would be quarter one of 2021. The finalist list is your approval provided you get the documentation required in to the state. Funding would be available during the third quarter of 2021.

Council Member Bauman asked who uses this park. Is it accessible to the public or is it for the neighborhood, the school. He does not think he has ever been there.

Director Perry stated that there is a greater neighborhood around it and the Ridgeview Charter Middle School it right beside it; he is sure that kids use it a lot. He replied that it is right across the street from the school.

Council Member Paulson just as a point of clarification, is this a City of Sandy Springs park? It is not part of the school, it is Sandy Springs.

Council Member DeJulio stated that it is actually adjacent to the school.

Motion and Vote: Council Member DeJulio moved to approve Agenda item 2020-259, Resolution to Approve Submission of an Application for Funding from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources' Land and Water Conservation Fund. Council Member Bauman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-124

- E. 2020-260** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration of a Resolution to Approve a Contract with Chappell Construction Group for Hammond Park Erosion Control and Site Improvements

Michael Perry, Director of Recreation and Parks this item that we have discussed at one of the workshops about the improvements that are necessary to Hammond Park. You allocated dollars in this fiscal year's budget to make major erosion repairs to the park. Once those are complete, Phase II will be installation of new turf on the field that we will bid out separate from this. This item was Bid #21-007, was bid September 9, 2020; the bids were received on September 28, 2020. The major elements of this were: 1. Install retaining walls and stairs; 2. Install storm drainage manholes, storm utility piping, and various erosion control measures; 3. Replace sidewalk and stairs; 4. Construct and install foot bridges; and 5. Install grass sod, shrubs, trees and grasses. The bids that were received, there is quite a range between them, from \$739K submitted by the low bidder, Chappell Construction Group; to a bid in excess of \$3M. We have done business with Chappell Construction; we have great confidence in them and we would recommend award of this contract to the low bidder. There are a couple of slides to share, which goes into a little bit of the elements contained in the bid. Green infrastructure means stormwater, bioswales, and soil stabilization through planting native and adapted species. Looking at the map, this addresses everything off the main road at Hammond Road. The entirety of the park will receive a great benefit with the green infrastructure, the stormwater pipes, grading and retaining walls, also included around the gymnasium and tennis courts and trails circulation, boardwalk, concrete and slate chip walkways.

Council Member DeJulio stated that Michael Perry and his group have done an excellent job on Hammond Park. Hammond Park is probably one of the heaviest used parks in Sandy Springs. It is almost used 24/7. There are people out there all day, all night and we have put money into Hammond Park before, about 10-15 years ago, we put new turf in there, and it is in constant use. They have done a wonderful job with the redevelopment and the improvements they have done in the gymnasium and the other facilities there. He believes it is exceptionally important for our residents that we go ahead and improve this park even further.

Motion and Vote: Council Member DeJulio moved to approve Agenda item 2020-260, Resolution to Approve a Contract with Chappell Construction Group for Hammond Park Erosion Control and Site Improvements. Council Member Reichel seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-125

- F. 2020-261** Request for Mayor and City Council Consideration to Approve a Resolution to Re-appoint Chip Collins to the City of Sandy Springs Development Authority

Mayor Paul presented that we are entering the appointment phase of the year, he has several appointments he will be bringing before Council, and this is the first of several. Asking to re-appoint Chip Collins; he is currently the Chair of the Sandy Springs Development Authority; he has done a great job; very knowledgeable about what needs to be done brings great legal background to the Authority. He has served on this body. He understands what we are trying to accomplish as a group. He normally limits appointment to 2 terms; this would be his third term but he feels that the institutional memories, since we are going to be replacing several member of this body over the next month or so, having him help train the new members is something he feels is very important.

Council Member Burnett wanted to echo the comments of the Mayor. He feels that Mr. Collins is a great asset to the City and glad he is willing to serve another term.

Motion and Vote: Council Member Burnett moved to approve Agenda item 2020-261, Resolution to Re-appoint Chip Collins to the City of Sandy Springs Development Authority. Council Member Paulson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-10-126

X. REPORTS

A. 2020-262 Mayor and Council Report

B. 2020-263 Staff Reports

1. August 2020 Unaudited Financials

Andrea Surratt, City Manager presented that this covers two months of our fiscal year. So it is just July and August. We will focus on August. The first part of the financial report related to COVID expenditures and how they have been affected. Some have gone up and down. This reflects the pattern of behavior in the community. You can see that Municipal Court, Alcoholic Beverage Excise Tax, and Business Occupational Tax have increased; Interest Revenue, Recreation Program Fees, and Hotel Motel have decreased. The Motor Vehicle TAVT payment is one that shows as a \$0, but we received that payment and posted September 1, 2020. That amount is up quite a bit from August 2019. It is now \$338,802 over \$209,588 last year, so people are purchasing vehicles. Finally, the one that is hardest hit again is Hotel Motel, 86% of our gap between last year and this year in August made up from the decline in Hotel Motel revenues. We have received \$1.5M of the \$4.5M in CARES Act Funding from the County, so that continues to come in and we have expenditures in Emergency Management budget and other line items that we are covering with those funds. The total General Fund Budget, we are at 16.67% of the year, we always report in arrears under the Modified Accrual Basis, and so with that it is a very typical time of year when we have some revenues coming in all at once or some expenditures happening early; therefore, it makes the month-to-month amounts appear a little strange. Revenues such as Electric Franchise and Insurance Premium Tax occur once per year. They will affect the monthly reporting when we get those. We have looked at every department line item and we are on track, per department, with expenditures under budget. Our Cash and Investments are right in line for where we need to be as well. We have \$67M in the bank and \$76M invested through Georgia Fund One; total Cash and Investments amount of \$144,629,659. The great story to tell you though is our Local Option Sales Tax, this is not the distribution coming from the state, that is in October; we will see that additional amount in October. Even though our amount is down slightly, for the month of August, at \$158,729, that is 7% down from last year this time but, in September of this year we have received the September numbers and we have collected \$2.3M, which is \$251K more than last month and \$64K more than the previous year. This starts to talk about a slight upward trend. The highest month of Sales Tax Collection that we have seen in the last 4 years was last December 2019. She found that last December was the highest we had collected in the 4-year stretch; we are only \$400K away from that amount. We received more \$2.36M is better than 9 months of 2019. This is a good sign of some stability in our Revenues.

Mayor Paul stated that the Legislature did us two favors last year reflected in these numbers. One, they adjusted the TAVT they promised when they changed it that local governments would be made whole and here we are six years later, they haven't been, but they made an adjustment again in this past January that appears to get us at least closer. Then the Legislature capturing the sales tax from online, particularly during this period, when more and more people are ordering things online, this is probably the case as he sees the number of packages he sees stacked in front of his house every day. Those sales tax revenues are helpful. Based on the traffic he is seeing on Saturdays and Sundays on Roswell Road, he believes that people are out buying again.

City Attorney Lee said there is one issue he would like to bring up. Speaking of the Legislature as a good segue, in their infinite wisdom, last session they enacted about seven different alcohol laws that affect our ordinances. Two of them he wanted to ask the Council about and make mention of publically because we have had so many inquiries either through the Permitting Office or through Economic Development. The Legislature saw fit to allow the delivery of alcohol. It applies to those establishments that already have a pouring package, malt beverage or distilled spirits license. It is a rare occasion where it is an opt-out provision for the City. This means that unless you act to stop

Regular Session of the City of Sandy Springs City Council
Broadcast Via Live Webinar and Teleconference, Tuesday, October 20, 2020
Page 15 of 15

licensed establishments from delivery, allowed to deliver now. We have had many inquiries from restaurants asking for it, to promote their sales and to keep their sales up. That is in place, right now, without any action on your part. The Legislature also allowed that, whereas Sunday sales could begin at 11:30 am, they have changed it to 11:00 am. That can be changed is the Council so desires by a simple ordinance.

Mayor Paul queried Council as to these changes. He asked if everyone was okay in allowing restaurants to deliver alcohol. He next queried about passing an ordinance to change the 11:30 am time on Sundays when alcohol could be sold to 11:00 am. He instructed City Attorney Lee to bring an ordinance.

XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. 2020-265 Litigation & Real Estate

Motion and Vote: Council Member Paulson moved to approve Agenda item 2020-265, suspend Regular Order and to enter into Executive Session for the purposes of discussing Litigation and Real Estate. Council Member Burnett seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session began at **9:18 pm**

Motion and Vote: Council Member Bauman moved adjourn Executive Session. Council Member Soteres seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session adjourned at **10:18 pm**

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion and Vote: Council Member DeJulio Adjournment of Regular Session. Council Member Bauman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at **10:18 p.m.**

Dated approved: November 3, 2020.



Russell K. Paul, Mayor



Lia Jones, Interim City Clerk

