



# City of Roswell

38 Hill Street  
Roswell, Georgia 30075

## Meeting Minutes Mayor and City Council

*Mayor Jere Wood*  
*Council Member Nancy Diamond*  
*Council Member Rich Dippolito*  
*Council Member Kent Igleheart*  
*Council Member Jerry Orlans*  
*Council Member Betty Price*  
*Council Member Becky Wynn*

---

Monday, June 13, 2011

7:00 PM

City Hall

---

### WELCOME

**Present:** 6 - Mayor Jere Wood, Council Member Nancy Diamond, Council Member Rich Dippolito, Council Member Kent Igleheart, Council Member Betty Price, and Council Member Becky Wynn

**Absent:** 1 - Council Member Jerry Orlans

*Staff Present: City Administrator Kay Love; Deputy City Administrator Michael Fischer; City Attorney David Davidson; Community Development Director Alice Wakefield; Planning & Zoning Director Brad Townsend; City Planner Jackie Deibel; Fire Chief Ricky Spencer; Deputy Fire Chief Ricky Burnette; Deputy Fire Chief Tony Papoutsis; Deputy Fire Chief Paul Piccirilli; Chief of Police Dwayne Orrick; Recreation, Parks, Historic and Cultural Affairs Director Joe Glover; Recreation, Parks, Historic and Cultural Affairs Assistant Director Morgan Rodgers; Superintendent of Athletics Jeff Knighton; Director of Transportation Steve Acenbrak; Land Development Manager Clyde Stricklin; Environmental/Public Works Director Stuart Moring; Community Relations Coordinator Kimberly Johnson; and Deputy City Clerk Betsy Branch.*

### Pledge of Allegiance

*Mayor Wood announced that June 14, 2011 is National Flag Day and asked the Sons of the American Revolution to post the flag. Andrew Conohan led the pledge.*

### CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Approval of May 9, 2011 Council Meeting Minutes (detailed minutes to replace Council Brief minutes adopted on May 23, 2011); Approval of May 23, 2011 Council Brief; Approval of June 1, 2011 Open Forum Council Brief; Approval of June 1, 2011 Special Called Council Meeting Brief.**

**Approved on the Consent Agenda**

2.

**Approval of a Resolution to submit an application for the Bureau of Justice State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) FY2011 Grant.**

*Public Safety*

*Public Comment:*

*Lee Fleck, Martins Landing, referred to an overhead slide and stated he would be addressing Consent Agenda Item #2. Mayor Wood read the agenda item. Mr. Fleck requested an explanation of the dollar value, logistics and all of the statistics for this item.*

*Kay Love responded to the question and stated that the previous year the City received \$38,000 for this grant and this is for an application this year. She stated it would be based on the number of days of incarceration, who have at least four consecutive days during the reporting period of undocumented criminal aliens. There is no match required for the City; the city provides the information and is reimbursed the dollar amount.*

*Police Chief Dwayne Orrick explained this is authorization for the City to apply for the grant and the numbers will be computed but at this time the amount is not known. The information will be sent to the Federal Government and they will let the City know what the funding level will be.*

*Mayor Wood asked Chief Orrick to explain how the formula works for reimbursement. Chief Orrick stated no one knows exactly how the formula works; the City presents the data and the funding is sent back.*

*Mr. Fleck stated since there is no specific information and Chief Orrick is relatively new in his position, he would like to present documents that deal with the real cost and where the information is tabulated from within the Police Department. He referred to the overhead slide and pointed out a multi-page report that was developed by the City of Roswell Detention Center. Mr. Fleck said he believes the actual number approaches 80% of non-citizens from Mexico incarcerated in Roswell's facilities. He said this information is additionally supported by the Detention Center Consulate Notification Form which is provided based on UN requirements; any member of the United Nations must allow foreign nationals the right to notify their Consulate. He said this form is completed by the individuals; for the year 2010, the grand total is close to 1900 foreign nationals who identify themselves as non-citizens. The actual dollar value for incarcerating foreign nationals in the City of Roswell for almost 5,050 days at an average cost, as provided by Chief Orrick's predecessor, is \$75.00 per day. Mr. Fleck said the annual cost to incarcerate illegal aliens in the City of Roswell is \$378,620.00. Mr. Fleck said another analysis conducted by the City of Roswell Police Department is arrest by ethnicity; arrests of Latinos only represents 14% of the population; it has escalated within the last two years and has exceeded the rest of all other ethnicities in the City of Roswell. Mr. Fleck said he is presenting this information as factual support of the need to pursue and request funds from the State and Federal government.*

*Mayor Wood thanked Mr. Fleck and said he appreciated his support for this agenda item.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Price asked if there is any history or expectation that money received would offset that.*

*Chief Orrick responded last year's fund was approximately \$33,000 and there is a*

requirement of a minimum of four continuous days for undocumented aliens. Most are in and out within that number of days so there is no refunding. He said this funding would help reset a small portion, but only about 10%.

Mayor Wood replied no, the City does not expect this would compensate for costs but it is all that is available. He added the citizens of Roswell have an option of either not jailing these individuals or putting them in jail and in that case the City is not compensated. The Mayor said he thinks it is the practice of the Police Department to notify the Federal Government each time there is an undocumented alien in the City jail and to ask if they want to pick them up. Mayor Wood said there is seldom a positive response. Chief Orrick replied that is correct that occasionally the Federal Government comes but not often. Chief Orrick noted that the incarcerated individuals are also given notification rights and a great majority will not ask to speak to their Consulate.

*Public Comment:*

Frank Berna, 435 Waverly Hall Drive, Roswell, asked why the City does not keep the individuals in the jail for four days so the City can be reimbursed.

Mayor Wood replied it costs more than the amount reimbursed to hold them four days. He said every day they are in the jail the City loses money; keeping them four days would not offset the cost.

Chief Orrick stated that often times, Federal Grants will fund a program for a set amount and then devise the formula, after they determine the amount amongst the cities available.

**Approved**

3. **Approval of a Resolution to purchase Right of Way as part of the MARTA Offset Pedestrian Improvement Project in the amount of \$40,726.**

*Transportation*

**Approved**

4. **Approval of a Resolution to rename Mills Park at Foe Killer Creek "The Dotsie Garner Mills Park."**

*Transportation*

**Approved**

### **Approval of the Consent Agenda**

A motion was made by Council Member Wynn, seconded by Council Member Diamond, to Approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

In Favor: 5

## REGULAR AGENDA

### Mayor's Report

1. **Recognition of Roswell Deputy Fire Chief Ricky Burnette for receiving the Dennis Lockridge Emergency Medical Services Pioneer Award.**

*Fire Chief Ricky Spencer recognized Roswell Deputy Fire Chief Ricky Burnette for receiving the award from the Georgia EMS District III for his dedication, experience, education, and training in the EMS field. Criteria to receive this award include playing a role in the conception and development of Georgia's EMS, continued enhancement of Georgia's EMS and development and expansion of training at Georgia's EMT's, as well as involvement in the public awareness and support of EMS. Mr. Burnette has over 25 years of service in the Fire Department in EMS and has done all of this and more through his years. Chief Spencer stated Mr. Burnette serves as Deputy Fire Chief of Operations overseeing the fire trucks, EMT's, paramedics and rescue trucks and was grateful for everything he has done in the field of EMS for the City of Roswell and the State of Georgia.*

*On behalf of the City of Roswell, Mayor Wood expressed his gratitude to Mr. Burnette. Mayor Wood stated that most of the calls to the Fire Department are EMT calls and that the City is grateful to Mr. Burnette for taking a leadership role and helping create the EMT system and making Roswell a safer and better place to live.*

2. **Presentation to the winners of Roswell's On the Fringe Miniature Golf Challenge.**

*Morgan Rodgers, Assistant Director of Recreation, Parks, Historic and Cultural Affairs introduced Will Penscott, a Roswell High School and Georgia Southern University graduate interning with the Roswell Recreation and Parks Department. Mr. Rodgers stated that as part of his internship, Mr. Penscott completed a major project involving a partnership with a Roswell business. Mr. Penscott explained that this project included the development of the Roswell Recreation and Parks Department's first "On the Fringe Miniature Golf Challenge" family event held on April 30, 2011. Over 100 participants competed in seven different age groups. Mr. Penscott noted that the Recreation and Parks Department partnered with The Fringe at Area 51 in Roswell with sponsorship from local churches and businesses. He thanked the following churches and businesses for their sponsorship: The Fringe at Area 51, World Harvest Church, Roswell Presbyterian Church, Dick's Sporting Goods, Crown Sports Soccer Wholesale, Chick-Fil-A, CiCi's Pizza, Brewsters, Orange Leaf, Sonic, Moe's and Starbuck's. Mr. Penscott expressed his appreciation to Morgan Rogers and Jeff Knighton for their assistance throughout the event. Twenty-one winners from seven age groups were individually recognized.*

**Announced**

3. **Reading of a Proclamation for National Flag Day on June 14, 2011.**

*Mayor Wood proclaimed the City of Roswell's intention to share actively in National Flag Day on June 14, 2011. The Mayor invited all citizens to join in the common declaration of faith represented in the words of the Pledge of Allegiance.*

*Mayor Wood read the proclamation and recognized the Sons of the American Revolution. Mayor Wood recognized the Sons of the American Revolution and the Roswell Rotary Club and asked Andrew Conohan to come forward. Andrew stated that for the past ten months he has been involved with the Roswell Rotary Club through the Georgia Rotarian Student Program. He talked about a trip to the Bahamas as part of a Rotary Club program assisting with the vision care of children's eyes. Andrew expressed his gratitude to the Roswell Rotary Club for their involvement in the student sponsor program and said his time in Georgia has been an amazing experience. The Roswell Rotary Club presented Andrew with an honorary letter signed and sealed by Georgia Secretary of State Brian Kemp acknowledging the Roswell Rotary Club for hosting the Georgia Rotarian Student Program and proclaiming Andrew Conahan an Honorary Georgia Citizen, as a goodwill ambassador. Roswell Rotary Club member Dave McCleary and Mrs. McCleary were recognized for hosting Andrew's stay in Georgia. Mr. McCleary presented Andrew an official state pin.*

*Mayor Wood was presented with the Silver Good Citizenship Award from the Sons of the American Revolution. It was noted that Mayor Wood was elected in 1997 and is now serving in his fourth term. While Mayor Wood has been in office, Roswell has been named one of the top three cities to raise a family, the sixth best place in America to retire, the eighteenth safest city of the top twenty cities in the United States with a population under 100,000, and the best place to live in metro Atlanta. Mayor Wood accepted the award on behalf of the City of Roswell, City Council, City staff, and the citizens. The Mayor stated that it takes the entire town to achieve these goals. He thanked the Sons of the American Revolution for the honor.*

**Community Development - Councilmember Betty Price****4. RZ11-01 Text Amendment for sign code changes to allow additional ground signage and wall signage for properties with 1200 feet of road frontage in Commercial Zoning district. (Second Reading)**

*Presented by Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director*

*Councilmember Price introduced this item. Planning and Zoning Director Brad Townsend stated this proposed text amendment to the sign code is to allow for wall signage and ground signage for properties in excess of 1200 feet of road frontage. This proposed text amendment passed on first reading. Mr. Townsend explained that at the first reading, Council directed staff to determine the number of parcels between 800 and 1000 feet, as well as 1000 and 1200 feet, and what number of parcels would be over 1200. Mr. Townsend stated that at the first reading, he guessed the number would be 25, but there are actually 26 parcels over the 800 foot of linear road frontage. He noted that this afternoon he had emailed Council a listing of those parcels and the locations, as requested. Council also requested what would be done dealing with reducing it from 1200 to 800, it then would go from 9 parcels to 26 parcels. Mr. Townsend stated there was further discussion related to making sure that anyone or parcel that would be approved for a second sign would be required to bring an existing ground sign into conformance. That language was also added to the proposed text amendment. Council also discussed removing the 70%, 30% sign base ratio. At first reading, the sign base was a minimum height of 3 feet. A request was made to modify that to a minimum of 2 foot base, not to exceed a 5 foot base.*

*Mr. Townsend, referring to page three of the proposed text amendment, stated that the other area of discussion related to dealing with the wall sign, trying to determine the wall being parallel to the street frontage, and allowing an additional sign. He noted there was also Council discussion dealing with how we would treat numerous parallel frontages, which may have changes in direction but are the same establishment. Mr. Townsend explained that both he and City Attorney David Davidson worked on crafting language for Table 22.18 (3) of the text amendment, regarding the number of signs allowed, to control the number of signs per establishment for parallel public road frontages. Mr. Townsend stated the following language was recommended to be included in the Table 22.18 (3), if Council so approved: Number of Signs Allowed: 1 per individual establishment wall parallel to public street.*

*Mayor Wood stated he did not understand and asked that Mr. Townsend to diagram how it would work. Mr. Townsend drew a diagram which was projected on the overhead screen. He noted a parcel that has 1200+ feet of road frontage; the 150 foot establishments; and one establishment in an entire building. He said they tried to draft the proposed text amendment so that they would only get 1 sign, not to exceed 128 square feet and not be allowed a second sign or a third sign on those locations. Mayor Wood asked for an example of where someone has an establishment that looks like this and where it would apply, for the practical impact. Mr. Townsend replied that staff was asked to draft something as a possibility and therefore he did not have a particular establishment in mind. Mayor Wood said he was trying to figure out why this is needed and asked for Council to respond.*

*Council Comment:*

Councilmember Dippolito stated he spoke earlier in the day with Mr. Townsend and asked if this centered around Roswell Town Center, for example, in the case like Big Lots where there is a long building and a section protruding, and if in that instance, would the City allow one per wall, then that center section gets its own sign, and then each wall to either side would get its own sign. Councilmember Dippolito noted that Mr. Townsend's answer was yes. That would be 3 signs. Councilmember Dippolito said that is not the intent. He stated that although it is not staggered, there would be a center section that would protrude out, which actually happens in most large sections.

Mayor Wood asked for clarification if what was being said was that a wall sign could only be put on one side of the building. Mr. Townsend replied no, it is all of the pieces together; it would have 1200 feet of frontage as one establishment, one entity in the building.

Mayor Wood replied that we had monument signs and were talking about 1200 feet of frontage. He understood that it is the same ordinance but he still did not understand this. The Mayor thought that in regard to the 1200 feet, they were speaking about monument signs. Mr. Townsend replied that it is monument and wall signs, the ordinance deals with both; that was how it was drafted. Mayor Wood asked for more clarification. Mr. Townsend replied "You have 1200 feet of road frontage. You are in any of the commercial zoning districts O-P, C-1, C-2, C-3 with that 1200 feet of road frontage." Mayor Wood said "Currently, you could have 1 monument sign. What is the current rule?" Mr. Townsend replied "Yes. We are dealing with wall signs now." Mayor Wood stated he would be taking it one piece at a time. Mayor Wood said "Currently, we are saying part of this ordinance, as I thought I understood it was, is that we were increasing the number of monument signs. Mr. Townsend replied that was correct and confirmed for Mayor Wood that it is one piece of the text amendment. The Mayor asked if currently, the City allows only 1 monument sign for a parcel of property. Mr. Townsend replied yes.

Mayor Wood asked if what is being said is that if the parcel of property has more than 800 square feet or 1200 square feet of some square footage, you could have more than 1 monument sign. Mr. Townsend replied that was correct and noted that would be linear feet. Mayor Wood noted that he understood the monument sign. He asked that the wall sign portion be explained. Mr. Townsend replied "You have the same square feet of frontage. You are allowed a wall sign on that wall." Mayor Wood stated "Now, most establishments with more than 1200, most projects with more than 1200 feet of frontage have more than 1 establishment, they have multiple establishments." Mr. Townsend replied that was correct. The Mayor Wood said he understood that so far. Mr. Townsend stated the maximum wall sign that they would be able to get would be 128 square feet. Mayor Wood asked if that was regardless of how big that big box was. Mr. Townsend replied that is the maximum square footage of the sign area, correct. Mayor Wood asked if it would be one sign for that side of the building, for the establishment. Mr. Townsend replied that was correct. Mayor Wood asked about signs on the right side or the left side. Mr. Townsend replied if there are corners and the like, then there are other codes that deal with sections on corners. Mayor Wood asked Mr. Townsend if what he was "really saying is they only get a sign on one side of the building unless they are on a corner." Mr. Townsend replied that was right. Mayor Wood replied he understood. Mr. Townsend noted that it is included in the code. Mayor Wood stated "Okay. Parallel to the street. I doubt if any of these buildings are actually truly parallel geometrically." Mr. Townsend replied "Probably not." Mayor Wood said he thought the intent was to have one sign on that side of the building. Mr. Townsend agreed. The Mayor noted that he has trouble understanding these things but understood the intent although he was not sure this was getting there.

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Price stated "I can think of at least one where the road isn't even straight, that it's got some waviness or curvature to it. So, going back to that picture that you had, does that mean on the perpendicular walls they get another 128?" City Attorney David Davidson replied "We could just take out the word parallel."*

*Councilmember Price replied that would make more sense.*

*Mayor Wood noted that he now understood it.*

*Councilmember Dippolito stated "The City of Alpharetta sign ordinance has similar language but they also, in parenthesis, say quarter tenants within strip shopping centers may have a wall sign on the end of the building in addition to the wall sign on the front of the building, so that accomplishes what we were talking about. I think one of the things we are trying to accomplish here was for buildings that are in a corner situation are allowed a second sign, which they currently are not under our ordinance. Is that correct Mr. Townsend?" Mr. Townsend stated that was correct. Councilmember Dippolito said he thought the question to Council is do we want to permit the corner, in a corner situation, having a second sign. Councilmember Dippolito read the City of Alpharetta's sign ordinance stating: "Corner tenants within strip shopping centers may have a wall sign on the end of the building in addition to the wall sign on the front of the building."*

*Mayor Wood noted that the Honest Automotive business facing Highway 9, has a wall sign over the bay doors. The Mayor said he thought that it is a reasonable application of signage and not offensive, but apparently, would not be allowed under this interpretation. Councilmember Price replied "That it is totally different. This is 1200 feet." Mayor Wood replied that the proposed text amendment states 1 sign per individual establishment. He asked if there is something else that would allow more than 1 sign per individual establishment. Mr. Townsend replied "With over 1200 feet of road frontage." Mayor Wood stated "If it is a small building you could have a sign on the side of the building but if it is big building, you cannot?" Mr. Townsend replied "No Mayor, I don't believe that is accurate." Mayor Wood stated he did not understand because it states "1 wall sign per individual establishment." Mr. Townsend clarified that it is with over 1200 feet of road frontage; if the property is less than 1200 feet of road frontage this code could not be applied to that piece of property. Mayor Wood asked if the property is more than 1200 feet of road frontage you would get 1 sign, but if there is less than 1200 you get multiple signs. Mr. Townsend replied no, it would be a smaller sign. Mayor Wood stated that in the case he was speaking of, there is more than 1 sign; there is a sign on the side and the front. Councilmember Price replied "Divided with the monument sign." Mayor Wood noted that he usually reads sentences and not charts. Mr. Townsend referring to the table and the columns within the table, pointed out the current sign code for wall signs, the zoning districts, maximum size area, total sign area footage, the number of signs allowed, and approved sign colors. Mr. Townsend explained that the proposed text amendment currently before Council at this meeting is drafted very similar to this to this section of the code, "Where if we have a business establishment within a planned zone center of C-1, C-3, OCMS, or I-1, they would get 128 square feet, allowed 1 square footage, 1 per wall, compatible to the building. The text amendment before you this evening added, 'if there is 1200 foot of frontage or more, you would get the additional wall sign on that establishment, maintained the maximum.' And, what we have been discussing is how do we deal with the 1 per wall. That has been the area that has been hard to comprehend how we are controlling it." Councilmember Price asked Mr. Townsend if he took row number 2 and not row number 4. Mr. Townsend replied "I believe I did take row number 4. I think that is the one I started with it." Councilmember Price disagreed and said "You*



*read the one that says planned center, but it is really not within a planned center; it really is the same anyway. Mr. Townsend agreed.*

*Mayor Wood asked if another block would be added to Chart 22 (a). Mr. Townsend replied yes, if Council approved. At the Mayor's request, Mr. Townsend displayed via the overhead projector, what the chart would look like. Mayor Wood asked if it is possible that there is more than 1200 square feet of road frontage with perhaps 2 establishments, that both would have 128 square foot signs. Mr. Townsend replied yes.*

*Mayor Wood asked where monument signs are mentioned in that block, within the table. Mayor Wood said "Well, I'm glad someone can understand it. It would take maybe another couple of hours for me to study it. I will withdraw my comments. I am simply saying I can't understand it but I'm just a lawyer and I haven't spent two or three hours. I am disappointed that it is written in such a way that it is not easy to understand or obvious because when things are difficult to understand, people get confused. And again, I am confused right now and I am not going to take up more time from this Council other than to say having practiced law for 35 years and read contracts and drafted things throughout that period of time, I like things that are simple and easy to understand and I'm sure if I studied this for another hour or two, I might understand it. But, I sympathize with our business owners and sign people who are trying to understand this sign and do not have a legal degree and do not have the assistance of the great minds of this Council."*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Price noted this change that has just come up today. She stated that striking "individual establishment" is a little concerning because if you have a number of establishments within, as this one says, within a planned center, then that means that only one of them can have a wall sign. Councilmember Price stated it was better when it said "per establishment."*

*Councilmember Igleheart stated that is now the proposed.*

*Councilmember Price replied "We put it back in and took out the parallel. Okay. This is the wording you would put on wall signs in block 4. Is that right?" Mr. Townsend replied yes.*

*Councilmember Igleheart stated this proposed text amendment has gone back and forth numerous times and that he was confused on at least what could be allowed by that parallel situation, but that may have been resolved. He said he was concerned about what the actual impact of this would cause since this started by trying to help one specific entity. Council had thought with the 1200 feet it would mean dealing with a few properties, but it is actually nine parcels spread around a number of places, which could result in many more signs added to numerous places. Councilmember Igleheart said he would not support it reduced to 800. He said he was not sure where the 1200 feet came from. Councilmember Igleheart noted that the Commerce Parkway property is apparently 2,000 feet of linear frontage.*

*Councilmember Price stated "I know that in a discussion with the Legal Department the other day, there was, and I am not sure which parcels they were, maybe you recall or know, otherwise, that if this were reduced to below 1200, that yes, it would increase the number of parcels allowed to have 2 signs but some of them currently have nonconforming signs that could be a tradeoff that we would get to have, if they exercise the option, to remove the nonconforming sign, to put in the second sign, or to put in 2 signs that would be smaller ground monument type signs. Can you tell me how many, let's say a thousand feet and above, of those 12, we would see the*

*reduction of some nonconforming signs?"*

*Mr. Townsend replied "Of the nine, probably all of them have a nonconforming sign." He said this probably would not really be that much of an incentive to reduce a 25 foot sign that they will never take down unless there is some financial backing to do so. Mr. Townsend noted that he was not sure that this code would meet that objective. There could possibly be someone that would take advantage of it but he did not know what that number might be. Councilmember Price replied "But, you think possibly at greater than 1000 foot that we could potentially see 12 nonconforming signs go away." Mr. Townsend replied there is that potential, but it is also possible that there would be none.*

*Councilmember Diamond stated she also thought, like Councilmember Price, that we are no worse off and we could be better off, for having made lower signs and nicer looking ones that conform to what we want. This is an opportunity and an avenue to encourage it. Councilmember Diamond noted the Holcomb Woods Parkway signage is "kind of horrendous." She said she was comfortable with the 800 foot. She noted that we make actually see a reduction in the impact visually.*

*Councilmember Dippolito noted that this started off as an attempt to try to help our cinemas get the signage they need and it morphed into something other than that. He said he supports helping our cinemas get appropriate signage, but was struggling with this ordinance; we resolved one problem and created another. Councilmember Dippolito pointed out that the 1200+ feet has had nine parcels listed but the list provided had seven. Mr. Townsend explained there "maybe two in a couple of the parcels." Councilmember Dippolito stated he understood and noted that Item 5 had three sites listed. He said "I think the changes to the wall sign help clarify that. I don't know if we have made it crystal clear, but I think it helps quite a bit. I think I'd be okay with the 1200 but I am very uncomfortable with it going down to the 800."*

*Councilmember Wynn stated "Every time we look at changing our text amendment for one special interest we have to look at the overall picture. We can't do just for one special entity, their own little ordinance. I am not really married to either the 1200 or the 800 linear feet. I am not one that likes a lot of signs, so I think there are some pros and cons both ways. But, again, any time we want to change a text amendment, we have to look at the impact of the entire city and just not one little entity and this is the reason why."*

*Mayor Wood stated "Even though I am not sure I fully understand the wall sign issue, I support the ground sign issue. I thought the purpose of this ordinance was to help our businesses, not one individual business. Some Council members seem to be concerned that by lowering the frontage from 1200 to 800 we will be helping more businesses. I think that is a positive thing, to help more businesses. Our businesses are struggling today, we have empty centers, we've got falling property taxes. I hope this Council will look upon this and not to help an individual but to help our businesses and hope they will support the motion that I anticipate to amend this ordinance."*

*City Attorney David Davidson conducted the second reading of an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF ROSWELL SIGN ORDINANCE TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL GROUND SIGNAGE AND WALL SIGNAGE FOR MULTI-TENANT CENTERS IN COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICTS WITH 1200 FEET OF ROAD FRONTAGE WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS OF ROSWELL, GEORGIA stating: pursuant to their authority, the Mayor and Council adopt the following ordinance.*

*1.*

*Article 22, of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Signs, Section 22.18  
Maximum Height, Maximum Sizes, Setbacks Requirements, and Number*

*Allowances, Section 22.18 (c) is amended as follows:*

*(c) Ground signs allowed under table 22.18(2) shall have a sign structure, which consists of the base and sign face, restricted to a sign base of no less than two (2') feet and no more than five (5') feet in height within the twelve (12) feet or fifteen (15) feet height limit. This regulation shall not apply to templates 25, 26, 27 and 28 as allowed under table 22.18(2) and detailed under table 22.18(8).*

*Table 22.18(2) Ground signs in Nonresidential Zoning Districts, and Table 22.18(3) Wall Signs in All Districts are amended as follows:*

*Table 22.18(2)  
Ground Signs in nonresidential Zoning Districts*

*Zoning District(s) and /or Use:*

*Multi-Tenant Centers on one parcel of record in OP, C-1, C-2, C-3, I-1, M-R, PV and OCMS (OP, C-1, C-2, I-1, M-R, PV and OCMS were added) with 800' (changed from 1200) or more of road frontage per road. (see footnotes)*

*Maximum Height of Sign: 15'*

*Maximum Size of Sign: 128 Square feet*

*Total Square footage Allowance: 128 Square feet*

*Minimum Setback from R.O.W.: 10'*

*Number of Signs Allowed:*

*2 per road frontage provided all ground signs are conforming*

*Approved sign Material:*

*Material compatible with that used in area (i.e. brick, stacked stone, wood)*

*Allowed Sign Styles for Ground Signs in Office, Commercial and Parkway Village Districts Refer to Table 22.18(8) (Sign Templates):*

*1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25a, 26b, 27b, 28b*

*\*\*\*\* Parcels with an excess of 800 (this was changed from 1200 to 800) feet of linear road frontage shall be allowed two (2) ground signs per road frontage. The signs shall be separated by a distance of at least 400 feet.*

*\*\*\*\* Provided all ground signs in the Multi-Tenant Center conform to current Zoning and sign provisions. (this was added after First Reading)*

*Table 22.18(3)  
Wall Signs in All Districts*

*Zoning District(s) and/or Use:*

*Business signs for individual establishments within a planned center on one parcel of record zoned OP, C-1, C-2, C-3, I-1, M-R, PV and OCMS with over 1200' of road frontage*

*Maximum Size Of Sign:*

*128 per wall per sign*

*Total Square Footage Allowance:*

*1 sf of sign allowance per linear foot of store frontage or an option of 32 sf if the store frontage is less than 32 feet in length.*

*Number of Signs Allowed:*

*1 per wall parallel to public street*

*Approved Sign Color:*

*Compatible with building architecture*

*Mr. Davidson noted that if approved, this would be the second reading of the ordinance.*

*Main Motion: Councilmember Price moved "to approve RZ11-01 Text Amendment for sign code as printed in our packet with the exception Table 22.18 (3), box number 4, return it to what it was at the first reading, which I believe was one. Well, as you had it up there. 1 per individual establishment wall. Is that what it said? One wall sign per individual establishment. Do we even need that last little part for public street frontage? Presumably it is not a street. Well, as written. End of motion."*

*Mayor Wood requested clarification on the square footage per sign, per monument sign, noting there had been much discussion about that. The Mayor asked if it remains at 1200 square feet in order to get the additional monument sign. Councilmember Price replied no. Mayor Wood replied "128 square feet if you have more than 1200 square feet, 1200 linear feet or frontage, you get an additional 128 foot monument sign." Councilmember Price replied "You are confusing the monuments and the walls. The monuments, it would be 800 feet of road frontage, 2 signs provided all ground signs are conforming. And, then, taking it separately, or we can divide the motion if you would like." Mayor Wood noted that it was fine, he was trying to get clarification.*

*Councilmember Price stated "The wall signs, would simply be as is the max in any of our codes, 128 square feet per wall per sign with that extra number of signs allowed, 1 per individual establishment per public street frontage, which is just new language. I don't think we find that anywhere else so it is superfluous, isn't it? Can we just get rid of it?" Mr. Townsend stated the Legal department provided that language to identify the public street frontage, which they thought was important. Councilmember Price replied that was when they were talking about "parallel and everything." Mayor Wood asked City Attorney David Davidson for an answer. Mr. Davidson replied that it would be up to Council to decide if they wanted to "get rid of it," but it would be fine. Mayor Wood asked City Attorney David Davidson to clarify if he was suggesting it say "One wall sign per individual establishment" or, was he saying to just eliminate it all together which it would go back to the standard rules for wall signs. Mr. Davidson*

replied that would limit the corner areas; there could be one for each road frontage now but if they went to what the Mayor had just said it would be just 1 (one) sign, total. Mayor Wood stated "So right now, if we say 1 (one) wall sign per individual establishment that would mean actually one wall sign per road frontage?"

Councilmember Price replied "No, total." Mayor Wood replied "One wall sign per establishment. So, if you happen to be on a corner you could still only have one wall sign." Councilmember Price stated it should go back in. Mayor Wood stated "I'm glad you all understand. I don't." Mayor Wood asked Councilmember Price to repeat her motion to approve the second reading with her amendments. The Mayor apologized for the confusion. Councilmember Price replied "There really weren't any amendments. It is as written in the book. With the exception of under Table 22.18 (3), box 4, 1 wall sign per individual establishment per public street frontage." Councilmember Price confirmed for Mayor Wood that if the individual establishment fronted on two streets there would be 2 (two) wall signs. She noted that there is a situation where there is really one street although it turns into 90 degrees by curvature and wondered if that is considered two street frontages, or one. Mayor Wood replied that would be one street frontage since it is one street.

Mayor Wood stated he understood the motion is to approve the ordinance as read with the change in the one block to say: One (1) wall sign per individual establishment, per street frontage. He asked Councilmember Price if that was accurate. Councilmember Price replied "So far, yes, but as we are noodling here does that in effect sort of negate what is elsewhere with corners?" Mayor Wood replied if it is a corner and it fronts on two streets, three could be a wall sign on each street. Planning and Zoning Director Brad Townsend agreed with the Mayor. Mr. Townsend agreed with Mayor Wood that it would be theoretically possible, if an isolated block existed, to have four wall signs, if there were four streets. Councilmember Price stated her motion was complete.

Mayor Wood clarified that the motion was to read the ordinance as read with the change in the block to read: One (1) wall sign per individual establishment per public street frontage.

Councilmember Price confirmed that was her motion.

Councilmember Diamond seconded.

*Council Comment:*

Councilmember Wynn said she thought she had understood Councilmember Price to say she was not really pleased with the 800 linear feet. She asked if Councilmember Price would be happier with the 1200, as written. Councilmember Price replied "Not knowing, not being able to predict who might take advantage of the opportunity to trade a nonconforming sign for 2 smaller signs, you know, I am hopeful that would be an incentive to do that. But, if not, it really is mute. Mr. Townsend wasn't sure how many between the 800 and 1000 this would apply to."

*Amendment:*

Councilmember Dippolito proposed an amendment to increase the road frontage to 1200 linear feet. Councilmember Dippolito confirmed it was for monument signs.

Mayor Wood clarified the amendment to the motion was to require 1200 feet of linear footage for an additional monument sign. Councilmember Wynn seconded for discussion. Mayor Wood invited further discussion. There was no further Council discussion. Mr. Townsend noted that it would be linear feet.

Vote: The amended motion passed 3:2. Councilmember Dippolito, Councilmember

Wynn, and Councilmember Igleheart voted in favor. Councilmember Price and Councilmember Diamond voted in opposition.

Mayor Wood clarified that Council would now vote on the first amendment "the amendment to change this box to say: One (1) wall sign per individual." He noted Council would be voting on the motion with the amendment to require 1200 square feet. It would be to pass the ordinance as read with two changes. One, it would be to change the 800 feet to 1200 feet. The second change would be to allow a wall sign for each individual establishment for each public street front, each street that it fronted on, not to exceed 128 square feet.

Councilmember Price asked if this had gone back to the first reading last month at 1200. Mayor Wood stated "That was passed 3:2."

*Amendment:*

Councilmember Price amended the motion to "In lieu of the 1200 or the 800, how about 1000." Councilmember Wynn seconded.

*Council Comment:*

Councilmember Dippolito requested more information on the 3 parcels that would be added by dropping it down to 1000. Planning and Zoning Director Brad Townsend answered "The three parcels - one on Scott Road - the 1000 to 1200 applies, actually on the back side of the Kroger Shopping Center, in that Scott Road location; the Mansell Road location is the Kroger Shopping Center, where the Blockbuster location is between 1000; and, that same shopping center frontage on Mansell, is between 1000 and 1200." Councilmember Dippolito asked if it would only apply to that frontage along Mansell. Mr. Townsend stated no, it would apply to both. There is 1000 feet at East Crossville and the Kroger Shopping Center; both are the Kroger Shopping Center.

Councilmember Diamond stated she was reviewing the list but had lost track whether the 800 feet was still a consideration. Mayor Wood clarified that Council was not discussing 800 feet. A motion had passed regarding that. Council was now discussing 1000 feet. Councilmember Igleheart noted that did come back. Mayor Wood said the discussion was currently about 1000.

Councilmember Diamond referred to the list and asked if he was certain. Mayor Wood noted a vote was still needed on that motion. Councilmember Diamond stated "I guess my general comment would be we want to encourage people to come in and do multi-use projects with large parcels and I think we need to make it as user friendly and as habitable as we can, and I am disappointed that there are 5 properties and one has 4 locations that we could get rid of nonconforming signs that we don't have that opportunity under this plan. But, if 1000 is all we can get, I will go with that."

Councilmember Igleheart stated "I don't think we are going to know the answer to this, but of those who are on the property list, do we already know whether they have nonconforming signs or not. So, what could actually be happening is we are allowing someone who doesn't have any signs, or may only have one, to get an extra sign, correct? Because, we don't know if it is nonconforming or not." Mr. Townsend agreed. Councilmember Igleheart stated there could be 2 or 3 new signs at the Kroger Shopping Center due to the new extra space there. Councilmember Igleheart said "I think we are really going off on a wrong avenue in saying this is suddenly going to reduce nonconforming signs, and plus, this changes the height from what used to be 12 to 15. So, it is not the great advantage, I think in the end, for what we are talking about."

*No further Council discussion.*

*Mayor Wood stated "At this time, I am asking the Council to vote on an amendment to allow an extra monument sign provided your linear frontage exceeds 1000 feet. We have a motion and a second. This is 1000 feet."*

*Vote: The amended motion passed 4:1. Councilmember Diamond, Councilmember Dippolito, Councilmember Wynn, and Councilmember Price voted in favor. Councilmember Igleheart was opposed.*

*Amendment:*

*Councilmember Price moved to reduce the maximum height of sign to 12 feet, located in column one, Table 22.18 (2). She stated "The only reason we actually made this 15 feet is because we were trying at that time, to incorporate anybody who had changeable copy for movie theatres. Since that is not an issue anymore, is there any will just to leave that at 12 feet?" Councilmember Igleheart seconded.*

*Mayor Wood Mayor Wood clarified that this amendment to the ordinance would return the maximum sign height to 12 feet. Mr. Townsend confirmed for Mayor Wood that it would be from the ground to the top. No further discussion.*

*Vote: The amended motion passed 4:1. Councilmember Dippolito, Councilmember Wynn, Councilmember Igleheart, and Councilmember Price voted in favor. Councilmember Diamond was opposed.*

*Mayor Wood stated Council would not revisit old motions already made.*

*Mayor Wood stated "As I understand it, the motion is to approve the second reading with these changes: The monument sign height is now limited to 12 feet. The linear frontage for the extra monument sign is now you have to have a minimum of 1000 linear feet. And, the individual wall sign establishments is 1 wall sign per individual establishment per public street frontage."*

*Councilmember Wynn asked Councilmember Price if she wanted to keep the separation of 400 feet since it went down to 1000, or did she want 500 feet.*

*Amendment:*

*Councilmember Price moved to amend the motion that the monument signs have to be at minimum of 500 feet apart. Councilmember Wynn seconded.*

*Clarification: Mayor Wood said "Here is the motion as I understand it. It is to approve the 2nd Reading with an additional monument sign if you have 1000 linear feet. The monument signs have to be 500 feet apart. You get one (1) wall sign per establishment per road frontage. And, the ground signs can be no higher than 12 feet." The Mayor invited further discussion. No further discussion.*

*Vote: The amended motion passed 4:1. Councilmember Price, Councilmember Wynn, Councilmember Dippolito, and Councilmember Diamond voted in favor. Councilmember Igleheart was opposed.*

*Mayor Wood noted this made the ordinance even simpler.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Wynn, that this Item be Approve with Changes. The motion carried by the following vote:**

Council member Price, Council member Wynn, Council member Dippolito, and Council member Diamond voted in favor.  
Council member Igleheart cast his vote in opposition.

In Favor: 4

Opposed: 1

5.

**RZ11-04 Text Amendment to allow sidewalk, sandwich or curb-type signs in the C-2 zoning district. (Second Reading)**  
*Presented by Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director*

*Councilmember Price introduced the item. Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director stated this proposed text amendment involves dealing with the sandwich ground signs in non-residential zoning districts. He said currently sandwich signs are allowed in the C-1 zoning district with the size to be 3'6" tall with a maximum of six square feet and the C-2 zoning district is being added. Current code regulation stipulates they cannot be placed on the sidewalk for a width of 36" to allow for clear passage on the sidewalk. Mr. Townsend stated the only amendment being added relates to allowing them in the C-2 zoning district; they are currently allowed in the Historic Area and C-1.*

*City Attorney David Davidson conducted the second reading of AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF ROSWELL ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING THE CHAPTER 22 SIGN CODE DEALING WITH SIDEWALK, SANDWICH, OR CURB-TYPE SIGNS IN THE C-2 ZONING DISTRICT, stating pursuant to their authority, the Mayor and City Council adopt the following amendment to the zoning ordinance:*

1.

*The City of Roswell is hereby amending Article 22 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 22.17 Signs Allowed in Specific Zoning Districts, wording to allow for a sidewalk, sandwich, or curb-type sign in the C-2 zoning district by creating said Section 22.17(l)(5) to read as follows:*

*(l) C-2 districts. The following types of signs shall be allowed and regulated within the C-2 zoning district of the city:*

*(5) Sidewalk, sandwich or curb-type signs as allowed in the C-2 (central commercial) zoning district.*

2.

*The City of Roswell is hereby amending Article 22 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Table 18(2) Ground Signs in Nonresidential Districts, as follows:*

*(Table 22.18(2) - See next page for complete table)*



*Table 22.18(2)  
Ground Signs in Nonresidential Zoning Districts*

**TABLE INSET:**

*Zoning District(s) and/or Use:*

*Sandwich or Sidewalk Signs for establishments in the C-1 and C-2 zoning district*

*Maximum Height of Sign:*

*3' 6"*

*Maximum Size of Sign:*

*6 Square Feet*

*Total Square Footage Allowance:*

*6 Square Feet*

*Minimum Setback from R.O.W. Line:*

*Must be situated to allow for clear passage with a minimum accessible sidewalk width of 36"*

*Number of Signs Allowed:*

*1 per establishment*

*Approved Sign Material:*

*The sign should be constructed of wood or metal and may be dry erase or chalk board style*

*Allowed Sign Styles for Ground Signs in Office, Commercial and Parkway Village Districts Refer to Table 22.18 (8) (Sign Templates):*

*"A" Frame or Easel*

*Mr. Davidson noted that if approved, this would be the second reading.*

*Mayor Wood stated comments would be heard before entertaining a motion. Mayor Wood said he has concerns about allowing sandwich signs in the public right of way. The Mayor said currently, political signs, or any other signs that he is aware of, cannot be put in the public right of way. Once the City allows the use of public right of way, it is public property used for private use. He said that sidewalk cafes are allowed on the street in the historic district under a license; if other uses are allowed in the public right of way, then licensing should be considered, rather than carte blanche for signs placed on public property.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Price stated the City is not starting this because the City already allows it; one small C-2 entity is being allowed to be the same as what is already being done. This could be taken up as a separate issue but this item is in conformity with what we are already doing; just adding a location.*

*Mayor Wood stated he recognizes it is in conformity with what we have approved in the past but said he believes it is a mistake.*

*Councilmember Dippolito responded that the ordinance states there is a minimum set back from the right of way line. He said he assumes that means the signs are not allowed in the right of way, but would have to be set back from the right of way line.*

*Councilmember Dippolito asked if that was correct.*

*Mayor Wood asked if this is referring to sidewalks that happen to be only on private property, if that was the case he agreed.*

*Councilmember Dippolito stated there is a box in the ordinance chart that reads "Minimum Setback from R.O.W. Line" and does not mention sidewalk.*

*Mayor Wood said a clause in the ordinance reads "Must be situated for clear passage with a minimum accessible sidewalk." Mayor Wood said that would be referring to private shopping centers that have sidewalks.*

*Councilmember Dippolito replied he assumed so or sidewalks that are not within the right of way.*

*Mayor Wood said he appreciated Mr. Dippolito's clarification and said it is a good solution to the issue he had. Mayor Wood said he is in agreement now that he understands this is not allowed in the public right of way.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Diamond, that RZ11-04 Text Amendment to allow sidewalk, sandwich or curb-type signs in the C-2 zoning district. (Second Reading) be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

**6. RZ11-05 Text Amendment for active recreational facilities in residential zoning districts. (First Reading)**  
***Presented by Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director***

*Councilmember Price introduced the item. Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director stated this is a clarification of language that is in Chapter 10 of the current ordinance dealing with active recreational facilities as a principal use. This is assurance that this is a requirement for the particular buffers for these types of uses in all of the residential zoning categories. Staff recommends approval at first reading.*

*Mr. Townsend confirmed for Mayor Wood that the buffer is a 50' setback from any property line, side and rear, and a minimum 25' wide natural buffer, which is the way the current language is written. Mayor Wood asked if that applies to day care centers. Mr. Townsend replied no, this is in a residential subdivision that has a tennis complex.*

*City Attorney David Davidson conducted the first reading of AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF ROSWELL ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING THE ALLOWANCE OF PRINCIPAL USE OF ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN ALL RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS OF ROSWELL, stating pursuant to their authority, the Mayor and City Council adopt the following ordinance:*

**1.**

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amended by deleting in Article 10 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 10.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows and Section 10.5 being reserved for future text amendments:*

**CHAPTER 10.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*In districts where permitted, playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided. (\*\*\*\*This Paragraph is being deleted\*\*\*\*)*

2.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.1 E-1, Single-Family Estate Residential District, adding Section 5.1.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.1.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided. (\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all Added\*\*\*\*)*

3.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.2 E-2, Single-Family Estate Residential District, adding Section 5.2.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.2.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided. (\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all Added\*\*\*\*)*

4.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.3 R-1, Single-Family Suburban Residential District, adding Section 5.3.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.3.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided. (\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

5.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.4 R-2, Single-Family Medium Density Residential District, adding Section 5.4.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.4.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.*  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)

6.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.5 R-TH, Fee-Simple Townhouse District, adding Section 5.5.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.5.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.*  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)

7.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.6 R-THA, Fee-Simple Townhouse Medium Density District, adding Section 5.6.4 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.6.4 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.*  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)

8.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.7 R-3, Multi-Family Residential District, adding Section 5.7.6 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.7.6 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.*  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)

9.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City*

*of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.8 R-3A, Multi-Family Medium Residential District, adding Section 5.8.4 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.8.4 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

10.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.9 R-4, Multi-Family Residential District, adding Section 5.9.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.9.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

11.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.10 R-4A, Multi-Family Residential District, adding Section 5.10.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.10.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

12.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.11 R-5, Multi-Family Residential District, adding Section 5.11.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.11.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided.  
(\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

13.

*The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roswell is hereby amend Article 5 of the City of Roswell Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 5.12 R-PUD, Planned Residential Development District, adding Section 5.12.5 Active Recreational Facilities as Principal Uses, as follows:*

**SECTION 5.12.5 ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PRINCIPAL USES**

*The location of playgrounds, community centers, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active recreational buildings and structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from any property line, and within the fifty-foot setback required along side and rear property lines, a minimum twenty-five-foot wide natural buffer shall be provided. (\*\*\*\*This paragraph was all added\*\*\*\*)*

*Mr. Davidson noted that if approved, this would be the first reading.*

*Public comment invited. None was heard. No further Council discussion.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Wynn, that RZ11-05 Text Amendment for active recreational facilities in residential zoning districts be Approved on First Reading. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

**7.**

**Initiation of a proposed text amendment addressing the location of used automobile sales establishments.**

*Presented by Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director*

*Councilmember Price introduced the item. Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director presented the item and stated this text initiation would require that used automobile establishments have a separate lot of record or parcel for them to be allowed to go through the conditional use process for Council review and approval. Staff recommends the initiation. On May 25, 2011, the Community Development and Transportation Committee recommended this initiation be brought forward for initiation.*

*Mayor Wood commented that his understanding is, for example, if there is a shopping center and you are a tenant in that center that would not create a second lot of record. Mr. Townsend replied that was correct. Mayor Wood stated car dealerships in shopping centers would have to have a separate parcel for the car dealership. Mr. Townsend replied yes, for a car dealership or other automotive uses that are permitted.*

*Public comment invited. None was heard. No further Council discussion.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Wynn, that Initiation of a proposed text amendment addressing the location of used automobile sales establishments be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

8. **Initiation of a proposed text amendment to allow for compact parking spaces in the Roswell Zoning Ordinance.**  
*Presented by Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director*

*Councilmember Price introduced the item. Bradford D. Townsend, Planning and Zoning Director presented the item and stated this is a proposed text amendment which would allow for a minimum of compact parking spaces to be eight and one half (8.5) feet in width and sixteen (16) feet in length as long as the total number of compact spaces does not exceed 15% of the total number of required spaces. This provides a third option from the two sizes that are currently in the code of 9'x20' or 10'x18' parking space size.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Price requested the additional language "and identified as compact" in the ordinance as presented. Councilmember Price noted that could be discussed in the future.*

*Mayor Wood commented that he has a parcel of property that has a gravel parking lot on which he would like to add some compact parking spaces. He asked if other signs would be necessary. Mr. Townsend replied that other signs would be provided. Councilmember Price commented that the Mayor would not know where the cars would park. Mayor Wood agreed, since it is a gravel parking lot. Councilmember Price replied that it is not an issue then. Mayor Wood asked how the spaces will be identified in a gravel parking lot. Mr. Townsend clarified that a plan indicating where compact parking spaces would be located should be provided to staff and staff would then make a determination as to how they would be identified. Mr. Townsend noted that if the plan accurately indicates the number of spaces and the 15% of the required number is not exceeded, then staff would be able to identify them in particular locations. Mayor Wood replied he understood and appreciated the explanation. Councilmember Price stated the identification would not necessarily have to be a sign, it could be on the pavement. Mr. Townsend replied it could be a tire bump and painted to identify it as a compact space, or something that would clearly show that is the intent.*

*Councilmember Wynn asked if having compact parking spaces is voluntary for the businesses and not a requirement that they must have. Mr. Townsend replied that was correct. Ms. Wynn stated the City is only limiting the number to 15% of the total parking spaces required. Mr. Townsend replied yes.*

*Councilmember Diamond asked if the purpose of this ordinance is to create compact parking in the City or to allow businesses to have the flexibility of adding spaces by using a compact size. Mayor Wood stated that as a business owner he would like this flexibility which would allow for more parking on his lot. Councilmember Diamond stated her point is that this is more of a calculation than enforcement. Mr. Townsend stated if adopted and initiated then staff will get into the enforcement aspect, if there is an issue.*

*Councilmember Dippolito stated the standard, typical parking space size is 9'x18' and virtually all spaces are this size except when they are compact. Roswell is a bit unusual but most places are 9'x18.' He suggested that moving toward a 9'x18' size should be explored over a 9'x20' space, which would save impervious area. Councilmember Dippolito asked that this be looked into.*

*Councilmember Igleheart stated that he has seen numerous parking decks in*

downtown Atlanta that have compact spaces that he suspects are even smaller than 9'x18.' The intention with this ordinance is to allow for parking for those who can no longer be on Canton Street to now be in the parking lot next to Pastis and said if that is the goal then it is now limiting those who could have parked on the street to just a compact vehicle. Mr. Igleheart cautioned on that aspect saying by allowing them to have smaller spaces within that one parking lot so that now there are more spaces than people would have for retail only, which is where all of this started. He added then put compact on top of that then you can only have that intention of going into those retail stores if you have a compact car and said that was a concern and he thinks this is being taken one step too far. Councilmember Igleheart said it should be a separate discussion as to whether there are additional spaces that then become compact, whatever size that is. He noted that if the standard is 9'x18' then he would have a problem with putting compact on it, at this point.

Mayor Wood stated there are many different reasons for doing this, but he supports it because it allows for more green space, less impervious surface, and addresses a parking problem in the historic district and allows more flexibility to individual property owners to accommodate what they expect their traffic to be.

Motion: Councilmember Price moved to Approve Initiation of the first reading of a proposed text amendment to allow for compact parking spaces in the Roswell Zoning Ordinance and one suggestion to add "identify such spaces as compact" and add a suggestion by Councilmember Dippolito to change the length to eighteen (18) feet. She asked if those should be called recommendations at this point. Mayor Wood replied if Councilmember Price had something specific in mind she could state it or just say "Initiate a text amendment to allow for compact parking spaces, and we will work out the details later." The mayor clarified that he needed to know what the motion is.

2nd Motion: Councilmember Price moved to initiate the text amendment and staff to take into consideration those comments made. Mayor Wood clarified that this motion was to initiate the text amendment to allow for compact parking spaces, the details to be worked out later. Councilmember Dippolito seconded.

Councilmember Igleheart stated he supports the ordinance and making the change but there should be further discussion about size as to what is considered compact.

There was no further discussion by Council. There was no public comment. The motion passed unanimously.

**A motion was made by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Dippolito, that Initiation of the first reading of a proposed text amendment to allow for compact parking spaces in the Roswell Zoning Ordinance be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**



**Transportation Department - Councilmember Rich Dippolito**

9. **Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a contract with CurbTech, Inc. for the construction of the MARTA Offset - Sidewalks Batch #1 Project in the amount of \$133,302.50.**

*Presented by Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation*

*Councilmember Dippolito introduced the item. Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation stated this is the first MARTA Offset project, Batch #1 Sidewalks; it has gone through design, permitting, and the procurement process and is now ready to go to construction. CurbTech, Inc. was the lowest responsible bidder at \$133,302.50; twelve bids were received. Mr. Acenbrak displayed an overhead graphic showing the location of four sidewalk projects which are on the north side of Hembree Road west of SR 9, the north side of Mansell Place east of SR 9, the north side of Houze Way east of Houze Road, and alongside the south side of Mansell Road from just west of Roswell Commons Drive extending 1500 ft. to the east, for a total of 3,400 linear feet of 5' sidewalk.*

*Mayor Wood asked Mr. Acenbrak to present the other MARTA Offset project (Agenda Item #10, and next on the agenda) in order to get them both before Council. The Mayor noted that he would invite public comment on both projects. (Mr. Acenbrak's presentation for the second MARTA Offset project is shown below under agenda item #10)*

*Mayor Wood confirmed for Councilmember Dippolito that there would be two separate motions.*

*Public Comment:*

*Frank Berna, 435 Waverly Hall Drive, asked if this is replacing the existing sidewalk or is it new sidewalk. Mr. Acenbrak stated this is new sidewalk. Mayor Wood stated typically, we are connecting existing sidewalks where there are gaps and that is why we call it Finish the Connection. Mr. Acenbrak agreed.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Dippolito pointed out that on Mansell Road there is a gentleman who has an electric wheelchair who he has seen more than once riding down Mansell Road, itself, which is extremely dangerous, and said he is glad to see this project in process.*

*Vote: The motion passed unanimously.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Dippolito, seconded by Council Member Igleheart, that a contract with CurbTech, Inc. for the construction of the MARTA Offset - Sidewalks Batch #1 Project in the amount of \$133,302.50 be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

10.

**Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a contract with Precision 2000 for the construction of the MARTA Offset - "Finish the Connection" Project in the amount of \$336,170.**

*Presented by Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation*

*Councilmember Dippolito introduced the item. Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation stated this second project is the "Finish the Connection" Project, and is another MARTA Offset project designed to help pedestrians get to and from the various MARTA stops; this one will go generally in the vicinity of Holcomb Bridge as it crosses over GA 400. Mr. Acenbrak explained that the City followed the procurement processes, sent out an advertisement, and received 8 bids. The lowest responsible bidder was Precision 2000, with a bid of \$336,170. The Finish the Connection project is a multi-modal safety improvement project that consists of pedestrian improvements along Holcomb Bridge Road as it approaches GA 400. The project will add sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals to improve safety and facilitate pedestrians crossing across the ramps of GA 400. The project will relocate the eastbound MARTA bus stop to between Old Dogwood Road and the SR 400 southbound ramp. The project will also reconstruct the median to extend the eastbound left turn lane for northbound SR 400 traffic and will re-landscape the median between Dogwood Road and SR 400 and add new trees between Old Dogwood Road and SR 400.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Dippolito stated this is another project where we have all witnessed safety situations and have seen people walking at night across the bridge and mothers with carriages and strollers going across the bridge and we are fortunate more people have not been injured so this is a great project and will add a lot to the safety.*

*There was no further Council comment. Public comment was invited. None was heard.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Dippolito, seconded by Council Member Wynn, that a contract with Precision 2000 for the construction of the MARTA Offset – "Finish the Connection" Project in the amount of \$336,170 be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

*Mayor Wood stated for the record that Councilmember Orlans is absent with an excuse.*

11. **Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a supplemental Project Framework Agreement with the Georgia Department of Transportation on SR140 (HBR) ATMS and SR92 ATMS projects and approval of Budget Amendment 4272G-06-13-2011 to establish the grant account in the amount of \$574,000.**

*Presented by Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation*

*Councilmember Dippolito introduced the item. Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation stated this project is an action to accept State Road and Tollway Authority funds which will supplement the existing project framework we currently have with the Georgia Department of Transportation for the Advance Traffic Management Systems, basically going across the east west corridor of the City which is essentially SR 400 and then SR 92. Mr. Acenbrak displayed a graphic and indicated that essentially this would be supplementing what we already have and filling in some funding gaps. One aspect of this project is the traffic monitoring devices. Mr. Acenbrak stated it was mostly funded. Mayor Wood asked if those are the cameras or traffic monitoring devices in which we observe traffic flow and try to make adjustments for traffic problems. Mr. Acenbrak agreed. He displayed a graphic showing SR 92 and SR 140, the major east west corridor across the City. He said we were mostly funded for the ATMS project; it was short one camera. He explained the the Adaptive Control System, which is a very sophisticated computer, which will not only detect the cars but will adjust itself as the capacity volume goes up and down. He added we were mostly funded west of GA 400, but there was a large gap in our funding to continue it all the way basically to the Gwinnett County line. This funding will allow us to get those adaptive control systems along the entire corridor. Mr. Acenbrak stated the project is filling in this funding gap.*

*Mayor Wood asked what the overall cost of the projects is. The Mayor stated he knew this approval is for \$574,000 tonight and asked if this is the overall cost, or is it a piece of it. Mr. Acenbrak replied that is just a piece of it. Mayor Wood asked how much the whole project is going to cost and the timeframe for this work to go in.*

*Transportation Engineer Muhammad Rauf stated the construction cost for the Holcomb Bridge Road part of the project is \$750,000. Mr. Rauf explained this is just the Holcomb Bridge part of the project; construction cost of \$750,000; \$600,000 of that is the Federal money; \$150,000 is the City 20% match. Mr. Rauf stated the other part of the project is Highway 92 and the total construction funds for that is \$500,000; \$400,000 is the Federal funding; \$100,000 is the City 20% match. Mayor Wood asked if that is \$1,250,000 for the entire corridor. Mr. Rauf replied yes, and on top of that the design fee is all paid by the City; it is already funded in the budget. Mayor Wood asked about the project timeframe. Mr. Rauf stated Transportation is hoping for June 2013 letting for the construction; it will take about a year or so to design. Mr. Rauf stated the design phase has started; in June 2013 we could start the construction with a completion time of about 12-18 months.*

*Council Comment:*

*Councilmember Dippolito stated this is part of an overall system that the residents of Roswell are very anxious to see get in place; signal timing is an issue that we have struggled with for a lot of years and we try to keep up with it but it's just extremely difficult without having an automated system. He said to clarify, the entire system will take us all the way from our western boundary to our eastern boundary and that is on Holcomb Bridge Road and SR 92, and then on SR 9 all the way from Sandy Springs to Alpharetta. He added when all of these are complete then we will have all the*

systems covered and hopefully that signalization will be much more streamlined and much more efficient. Mr. Acenbrak agreed. Councilmember Dippolito asked if there is a completion date for SR 9 as well. Mr. Acenbrak stated it is under construction. Mr. Rauf said it is a joint project between the City of Sandy Springs and the City of Alpharetta; Sandy Springs is the project sponsor and they are actually in the advertisement phase to hire a contractor to start construction in the next two to three months. That project has a completion time of 16 months, starting in the next 2-3 months. Mr. Rauf added Highway 9 is the project with the traffic control center as well at the Hembree facility where we will have the monitoring and controlling capability to all of those traffic signals on Highway 9. Mr. Dippolito asked if Highway 9 should be completed in the spring of 2013. Mr. Rauf replied yes. Mr. Dippolito asked when can we expect all of Highway 92 and Holcomb Bridge to be done. Mr. Rauf replied that in the middle of June 2013 construction will start on Holcomb Bridge and Highway 92 because we are designing that project now. Mr. Dippolito asked if that is another 16 months after that. Mr. Rauf replied about 12-18 months we normally say. Mr. Dippolito said spring of 2014, so we are a few years out and we will have this all taken care of. Mr. Rauf replied yes.

*Public Comment:*

Unidentified speaker referred to the graphic displayed and asked about a connection to Cobb County. Mr. Acenbrak said there is currently no connection with Cobb County.

Frank Berna, 435 Waverly Hall Drive, asked what kind of a gain are we going to get from this; what are the expectations in traffic reduction. Mr. Acenbrak replied there will be percentages of gains in different areas. Mr. Rauf stated he would not have a specific percentage. It will not resolve all of the traffic congestion problems which are mainly capacity issues; we cannot add 2 or 4 more lanes along Holcomb Bridge or Highway 92 but what we do with these computerized signal timing projects will provide the best efficiency out of our existing infrastructure. He added what these computerized traffic signal programs do is like a live person sitting on this traffic signal cabinet optimizing the timing at every minute of it basically so we won't have predetermined timing plans; we will have constantly updated real time traffic plans that will be the most efficient traffic signal timings you could ever have. Mayor Wood asked if there is an estimate of how much the traffic congestion delays or commute time from one end to the other might change. Mr. Rauf replied we basically hear about 20-30% improvement in the travel time; that is how we determine the efficiency. Mayor Wood stated if it takes 15 minutes you would have a 20% improvement over that if you were driving from Cobb to Gwinnett. Mr. Rauf said I can tell you 20-30% savings in the travel time. Mayor Wood stated that would make him a hero.

*Council Comment:*

Councilmember Dippolito stated he thought there was a great comment about connecting to Cobb County, and also to Gwinnett. He stated that the City has been successful in working with Sandy Springs and Alpharetta and he would like for us to reach out to Gwinnett and see what their intentions are and let them know we are doing this and perhaps they can line up some funding for their part as well. Mr. Acenbrak agreed. Mr. Acenbrak said the Georgia Department of Transportation is doing the Regional Traffic Operations plan where they are taking the major corridors throughout metropolitan Atlanta and looking to improve efficiency on all those corridors. Mr. Acenbrak stated the City is doing what can be done within its jurisdiction to improve the traffic flow but at some point GDOT overlaps all of our efforts and as well as into coordinating all of these things. He said it probably has created a bad impression to say we are not coordinated, we are not necessarily coordinated with Cobb County but it is absolutely GDOT's mission especially within

*their districts to make sure that absolutely does happen. Mr. Acenbrak said he did not have all the information but would be happy to scour that with the GDOT and find out what Cobb and Gwinnett are doing and report back to the Council on how these are all tying in together.*

*Councilmember Price stated she wanted to applaud this project. She asked what is the distance from the far west to the far east in miles. Mr. Acenbrak replied ten miles. Ms. Price stated it is a significant difference.*

*There was no further Council discussion. There was no further public comment.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Dippolito, seconded by Council Member Wynn, that a supplemental Project Framework Agreement with the Georgia Department of Transportation on SR140 (HBR) ATMS and SR92 ATMS projects and approval of Budget Amendment 4272G-06-13-2011 to establish the grant account in the amount of \$574,000 be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

### **City Attorney's Report**

12.

**Recommendation for closure to discuss acquisition of real estate, personnel and litigation.**

**A motion was made by Council Member Wynn, seconded by Council Member Igleheart, that Recommendation for closure to discuss acquisition of real estate, personnel and litigation be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

## **ADDENDUM TO AGENDA**

### **Transportation Department - Councilmember Rich Dippolito**

**Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a Project Agreement with the North Fulton Community Improvement District (NFCID) for the Sun Valley Connector project traffic analysis.**

***Presented by Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation***

*Councilmember Dippolito introduced the item. He stated this item was added as a result of our joint meeting with the North Fulton Community Improvement District (NFCID) on Friday which went extremely well. Steve Acenbrak, Director of Transportation stated we had a successful meeting on Friday with the Board of Directors of the North Fulton Community Improvement District in the same room with the Mayor and City Council discussing possible partnership agreements. Mr. Acenbrak displayed a graphic shown at the meeting which included SR 9. Mr. Acenbrak pointed to the Walmart Supercenter off of Mansell Road and said the idea is we have an area of SR 9 and Mansell in the quadrant at the center of the City that is under served by a traffic road network. He referred to Warsaw, Sun Valley, Mansell Place and Old Ellis Roads that are currently dead end roads which staff*

believes a grid network of some type in this area would be a significant improvement to the City. Mr. Acenbrak stated Transportation staff is thinking about travel lanes, sidewalks, bicycle, multi-modal use, large-scale economic development and trying to look for the most efficient way to connect these roads. A traffic study is needed to help determine if the road network needs to go mostly north and south with some stubs east and west or is it mostly an east west connection with stubs north and south; knowing those sorts of things will guide efforts in aligning this. He said we have worked with their staff, our on-call consultants, their on-call consultants and asked what it will cost to do a traffic study. Mr. Acenbrak stated staff has looked at the scope and identified that the scope needed is \$56,000; we would like to propose splitting the cost because the City of Roswell will benefit from this as well as the economic development aspects for the NFCID and their expansion efforts. He noted that if this passed tonight, he would be able to inform the NFCID Board of Directors at the meeting in the morning; if they are inclined to pass their half right away if could be possible that in 3-4 months the results of this study could be ready and that will allow us to begin our design efforts on the first phase of this road project.

*Council Comment:*

Councilmember Dippolito stated one of the important aspects of this improvement is that it will take a lot of pressure off of the Mansell Road and Highway 9 intersection and that will be somewhat alleviated by Transportation Engineer Muhammad Rauf's project for the ATMS but this will also pull a lot of cars that are headed northbound on Highway 9 off of Mansell. He asked if that is one intersection that will be studied as well as some others in the immediate area and how this will impact traffic in the general area. Mr. Acenbrak replied Councilmember Dippolito was correct. He explained that SR 9, going largely north and south through our City; and SR 140 which is Holcomb Bridge Road, that actually goes north at the SR 9 intersection until it hits Mansell Road and then jogs to the west until it hits Houze Road and then goes north again. Basically, there are two state route intersections at that intersection. There is a great deal of north-south traffic on SR 9; east-west traffic on Mansell; and traffic moving from SR 400 up to Cherokee County so there is a lot of blending of different traffic patterns in that area. Mr. Acenbrak stated Transportation staff believes that local traffic would be well served by having a grid system where they could make transportation options they don't have available to them now and businesses that would benefit greatly. He indicated the very large UPS distribution center with a high volume number of vehicles and stated that any number of them trying to leave the center and travel west must go either north up to Hembree or south to Mansell because they have no ability to go west at this time. That is just one example of many and said there are numerous distribution centers in the Hembree industrial complex that would benefit greatly; there are a number of car dealerships and other automotive light industrial in this area that would also benefit. Mr. Acenbrak said that not only from a traffic standpoint but from an economic development standpoint, we believe this is going to be a great shot in the arm for the City.

*There was no further Council comment. Public comment invited. None was heard.*

**A motion was made by Council Member Dippolito, seconded by Council Member Price, that a Project Agreement with the North Fulton Community Improvement District (NFCID) for the Sun Valley Connector project traffic analysis be Approved. Mayor Wood clarified that this was a motion to split the \$56,000 cost with the CID. The Mayor asked Mr. Dippolito if this was conditioned upon the CID also approving their half. Mr. Dippolito replied that is correct. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**In Favor: 5**

## **Adjournment**

*After no further business, the Mayor and Council Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m. for a work session to discuss the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plans.*