

**City of Decatur
Planning Commission**

**May 14, 2024 Regular Meeting
MINUTES**

Decatur City Hall
City Commission Room
509 North McDonough Street

Members Present: Rachel Cogburn (Chair), Marc Brambrut, Greg Chilik (Vice Chair), Jason Friedlander, Joe Greco, and John McFarland.

Members Absent: Jenny Stein

City Staff: Kc Krzic (Planning Manager), Angela Threadgill (Assistant City Manager), and Aileen de la Torre (Planner)

Call to Order at 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Cogburn confirmed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. She provided introductions of the Commission members and delivered an overview of the procedural process for the meeting.

Unfinished Business.

Approval of Minutes from April 9, 2024 regularly scheduled meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Brambrut, seconded by Mr. Greco, the minutes were approved as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business.

- a. The Community & Economic Development Department is requesting text amendments to Article 6 of the Unified Development Ordinance to clarify the utility services and meters between main buildings and accessory buildings/ dwellings.**

Representing the City of Decatur’s Community & Economic Development Department, Ms. Krzic introduced the text amendment to Article 6 to clarify the utility services and meter between main buildings and accessory buildings and accessory dwellings. Highlighted items include:

Sec. 6.8.1. – In General	Clarify utility services and meters between main buildings and accessory buildings
Sec. 6.8.3 – Accessory Dwelling Units	-Clarify utility services and meters between main buildings and accessory dwelling units -Allow building and fire codes to set bedroom occupancies
Sec. 12.1.1 – Defined Terms	Eliminate repetitive requirements already listed within Sec.6.8.1.

In a response to a question by Ms. Cogburn, Ms. Krzic stated that in accordance with the current code, an accessory building may have either a half bath or kitchen. If it has both a bathroom and a kitchen, it is considered an accessory dwelling.

In a response to a question by Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic confirmed that an accessory dwelling may or may not have separate services and meters. Since the code does not speak to accessory dwellings specifically about meters, this amendment will clarify the requirement. The internal policy is that they need to be connected to the meter of the main home. However, after looking at building and safety regulations, many times the existing house cannot support the additional services required by a full accessory dwelling unit.

In a response to a question by Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic confirmed that an accessory dwelling cannot exceed 800 square feet and all accessory buildings, including the accessory dwelling, cannot exceed 1,000 square feet. The uses can be contained within the same structure or multiple structures within the rear yard to meet the square footage allowances above.

In a response to a question by Mr. Brambrut, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the minimum square feet required for an accessory dwelling must be a minimum of 300 square feet and not exceed 800 square feet. She was unsure if there was a specific reason that the 300 square feet minimum was required when adopted in 2012. Mr. Chilik noted that the minimum is potentially due to the need to have enough room for a bathroom, kitchen, and living area. Ms. Cogburn recalled that when accessory dwellings were placed within the code, concerns were raised that they should be no smaller than a "tiny" home.

Having no more questions, Ms. Cogburn opened public comment. She asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the application. No one came forth to speak, so she asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition of the application. No one came forth to speak. The public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Cogburn called for a motion.

Mr. McFarland made a motion to approve the text amendment to Article 6 of the Unified Development Ordinance to clarify the utility services and meters between main buildings and accessory buildings/ dwellings.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Chilik.

In a response to a question by Mr. Friedlander, Ms. Krzic stated that non-conforming accessory buildings and accessory dwellings can be maintained and occupied in accordance with the non-conforming ordinances. If an owner wanted to make changes or additions, it would be reviewed by staff and may ultimately need a variance depending on what is being proposed.

Having no more discussion upon the vote, the motion was restated.

On a motion by Mr. McFarland, seconded by Mr. Chilik, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the text amendment to Article 6 of the Unified Development Ordinance to clarify the utility services and meters between main buildings and accessory buildings/ dwellings. The vote was unanimous.

b. The Community & Economic Development Department is requesting text amendments to Article 6, 7, and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of short-term rentals and provide associated regulation and permitting standards.

Representing the City of Decatur’s Community & Economic Development Department, Ms. Krzic introduced the text amendment to Article 6, 7, and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of short-term rentals and provide associated regulation and permitting standards. Highlighted items include:

Sec. 6.2. – Allowed Use Table	Add new commercial use of Short Term Rental
Sec. 6.3.7. – Overnight Lodging	Add Short Term Rental
Sec. 6.3.7.B.3 – Short Term Rental	Define Short Term Rental, limitation standards, creation of a local certified property manager, permitting and inspection requirements, collection of hotel/ motel tax, and revocation
Sec. 7.1.3. – Off Street Parking Requirements	Define parking associated with Short Term Rental
Sec. 12.1.1 – Defined Terms	Add new definitions

In a response to a question by Ms. Cogburn, Ms. Krzic advised that the public notice for these text amendments were as follows: advertised within the local newspaper, a public hearing at the Planning Commission, and a public hearing at the City Commission next Monday.

In a response to a question by Mr. McFarland, Ms. Threadgill advised that in 2022 the City posted signs to notify of the “Missing Middle” housing ordinance. In accordance with newly passed State legislation this was required because there would be an increase of density to the single-family zoning districts. Short Term Rentals do not meet this requirement. She further explained that is a companion piece to the missing middle housing ordinance. In 2021 and 2022, there were public conversation and public hearings where we heard a lot of concerns about how these units could potentially be used as short-term rentals, and that there should be standards put in place. This is also the reason why there is an 18-month phase in period for the missing middle housing that limits the number of permits to be issued for missing middle housing that allows us to implement regulations for short term rentals. The City Commission expected us to bring this draft ordinance to you all, and then to them for the final action. Furthermore, as noted in the memorandum, the City did solicit community input in 2022, and received both positive and negative aspects of short-term rentals.

In a response to a question by Ms. Cogburn, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the definitions were drafted to be specific to the City’s code and regulation needs. She did look at other jurisdictions definitions, both in the metropolitan area and out of State. The final definitions were reviewed and updated by the City Attorney.

In a response to a question by Mr. McFarland, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the draft text stated that duplexes, walk up flats, and stacked flats are limited to one dwelling unit per building to be used as a short term rental. Conceivably, any of these types of units could be completely used as short term rentals. She further explained that the current Unified Development Code does not address short term rentals. This is an odd situation, because there can be an argument made that we do not allow them. However, we do know that they are occurring, and we do collect hotel/ motel tax for them in accordance with State legislation. This amendment solidifies that the use is permitted and that there are subsequent regulations and permitting processes needed to have them. She also advised that if it is the pleasure of City Commission to approve this ordinance a permitting process will be incorporated that will allow the City to identify the location of these rentals and ensure that they are safe for the owners, renters, and neighbors.

She responded to an additional question stating that short term rentals are limited to stays that occur for less than 30 days. There could scenarios where a homeowner only lives within their home 8 months out of the year, and having the ability to rent their home as a short term rental could provide them the affordability that they need to maintain the home. As it relates to the missing middle and affordability conversation, this ordinance is another tool that can be tied together with several ordinances to achieve the end goal.

In a response to a question by Mr. Greco, Ms. Krzic explained that the rationale of limiting 2 people to a bedroom is to ensure that the neighborhood atmosphere is protected and there are not rentals to host parties and events where there are too many people in a home that could be disruptive to the neighbors, as it relates to noise and parking.

In a response to a question by Mr. Brambrut, Ms. Krzic explained that any existing short term rentals would be required to apply for a permit with the Community & Economic Development. If approved, a permitting software would be utilized that will function similarly to our current permitting process that allows applicants to submit online. There would also be a service to identify new short term rentals that are listed online. They would be contacted and have to submit through the permitting process. The permitting process would be administrative and include zoning, building, and fire marshal. It would not be heard by the Planning Commission. Additionally, the ordinance does not automatically "grandfather" any of the existing short term rentals.

In response to a follow up question, Ms. Krzic confirmed that multiple family developments would be allowed to have 1 per building.

In a response to a question by Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic stated that household speakers, even though not completely defined was reviewed by the City Attorney. The intent is that a short term rental is not being used for events or parties and there are not sound systems and bands within the rear yard. It is designed to have the rental be used just as any other homeowner would use their home. This is also why the draft ordinance ties back to the noise ordinance.

She also responded to a follow up question by Mr. Friedlander about Porchfest. She noted that events, such as those, are approved for a special event permit. So, if one of the rentals was on the event list, they would follow the requirements of the event approval just as any other homeowner.

In a response to a question by Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic stated that the revocation hearing would be held by the City Commission. The owner would have to be notified that there are problems occurring and they would be able to state their case at the hearing. She further stated that the identification of multiple violations would be for the internal staff to document and advise the owner of such infractions. The intent is not to document infractions and not advise the owner until the fifth infraction, but to communicate in a similar manner that is used for alcohol and business license violations. She further noted that enforcement would be by the Zoning Administrator and the Code Enforcement Officer. She knows that not everyone would know to reach out to the Zoning Administrator for an infraction. They would probably contact the Police, especially if it is after working hours. Yet, all calls would still be reviewed and documented by staff.

In a response to a question by Mr. Friedlander, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the term “guest room/sleeping room” is used to capture all rooms that could be occupied by a renter. We know that a pull-out couch or another space could be used for sleeping, even though it does not meet the building code definition of a bedroom. Mr. Friedlander thinks that the parking requirement may be excessive. She confirmed that a 4 bedroom home would require 4 parking spaces. The intent is that a rental utilized by 8 people typically has multiple cars and people traveling from different locations. Once again, it was to ensure that neighbors are not impacted, people are able to park their cars, and there are not back up upon the street.

In a response to a question by Mr. McFarland, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the “Local Certified Property Manager” will not be issued a certificate. Due to this, he believes that the language should be struck or modified. In response to a follow up question from Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the intent is to have one accountable person to contact for the property. He thinks that there may be a better word than certified. The Commission continued a discussion about who could be an accountable person and think that “certified” can be changed to “registered” or “designated”. It was determined that the word would be changed to “Local Designated Property Manager.”

Mr. Greco stated that he is concerned that the parking requirement is too restrictive. He noted that a rental could have 4 rooms, but not need 4 parking spaces. A Commission discussion continued about the parking calculations, how the listings would be provided, and that a short term rental is not being used as a traditional home. Ms. Krzic stated that she would not want to create a situation where staff has to “pick and choose” or make a separate determination on parking for each rental when being booked. Yet, lowering the parking requirement would be appropriate. The parking conversation continued, and topics discussed were protection of neighbors, would 3 bedroom homes have space for 3 parking spaces, on-street vs. off street parking availability, and enforcement. Ms. Krzic noted that in accordance with the Unified Development Code, an owner would be able to submit for a special exception of the parking requirement. This process requires the advertisement in the newspaper, the posting of a sign on the property, a public hearing at the Planning Commission, and a public hearing at

the City Commission. The Commission discussion continued. Ms. Threadgill clarified that parking can be tandem in the driveway, as long as it is behind the front of the house. Spaces do not need to be created or marked like in commercial areas. She reiterated that an applicant could seek a special exception that would allow the public to come out in support of the reduction if there is ample parking on the street. The ordinance is conservative, yet this is consistent with what was heard during the missing middle discussion and concerns raised about short term rentals.

In a response to a statement by Mr. McFarland noting that neighbors should be empowered with the property manager contact information or a hotline number to contact if problems occur on the property. Ms. Krzic confirmed that in addition to the permitting software, the City intends to create and host a 24 hour hotline where any neighbor, or anyone else, can call any hour of the day. Ms. Threadgill further stated that the Overnight Lodging Standards require the Zoning Administrator determines to post a placard for 15 days in a conspicuous location notifying the public that an application to establish overnight lodging has been filed with the city. The placard shall include information on where and when the pending application can be viewed. The Zoning Administrator shall keep a record of any comments submitted about the application during the 15 day advertisement period. No application shall be approved without the 15 day advertisement period.

In a response to a question by Mr. Brambrut, Ms. Krzic stated that the intent of only allowing duplexes, walk up flats, and stacked flats to have one unit per building as a short term rental was to ensure that an entire complex was not transformed into a short term rental only location.

In a response to a question by Mr. McFarland, Ms. Krzic confirmed that a fee would be collected for the permitting of the short term rentals applications. The fee schedule would be adopted by the City Commission. Currently, there is a fee for every application that is submitted. This includes the annual inspections from the Fire Department. An application would also be created that will identify the exact amount an applicant would pay upon submittal. The fee amount would cover the administrative costs to review, inspect, and issue the permit.

Having no more questions, Ms. Cogburn opened public comment. She asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the application. No one came forth to speak, so she asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition of the application. No one came forth to speak. The public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Cogburn asked if there was any Commission discussion.

Mr. Greco wants to reduce the parking requirements. He thinks that the parking provided upon the site could correlate to the rooms that would be allowed to be rented, i.e. if you have 2 parking spaces, 2 of the 4 rooms could be rented. He does not want owners to have to apply for a special exception. Mr. Brambrut and Mr. Friedlander agreed the parking is too restrictive. Mr. Friedlander noted that the parking calculation for a hotel is 0.75. A discussion among the Commission occurred to clarify how the rooms vs. parking would be calculated. Mr. Chilik discussed the way people travel who are staying at a hotel and staying at a short term rental. Ms. Threadgill wants to ensure that the language is simplified and defined as this text moves forward to the City Commission. Ms. Krzic and Ms. Threadgill want to guarantee that the parking calculation do not lead to enforcement issues, since homes have various

numbers of bedrooms and booking can change daily. After further discussion, it was agreed that the parking calculation would be 0.5 per guestroom/ sleeping room, and that numbers would round up. The second item, as noted previously, was that “certified” will be changed to “designated.”

Ms. Threadgill also suggested that any legacy short term rentals, as pointed out by Mr. Brambrut earlier, be required to come into compliance with the short term regulations within 90 days. The Commission agreed. A further discussion continued noting that if a short term rental did not meet the requirements, they would be required to cancel the reservation. Another reason for meeting all of the inspection requirements is to guarantee the safety of visitors and residents. Just like a hotel, this is a commercial lodging use and we should provide the same level a care and protection.

Mr. Brambrut stated that he is in support of all the regulations but is sympathetic to the fact that owners may not have seen the amendment on the Planning Commission’s agenda, which could be approved Monday night by the City Commission. To say that an owner has 90 days to comply, reservation could be canceled, and if you are in a condominium building there can only be one short term rental is harsh. He is sympathetic to the advertisement piece and wishes more notice could be given.

Ms. Threadgill noted that condominium and homeowner associations would need to provide the owner with an approval letter to use the unit as a short term rental, which would then be provided to the City. This would be the same for an apartment building, they would need approval from the property management team or property owner. Mr. Brambrut does not believe that we should limit multiple family buildings to one short term rental. He believes that if a homeowners association provides approval for 5 units, then 5 units should be allowed to be a short term rental. A discussion occurred among the Commission about the difference between walk up flats, stacked flats, condominiums, and apartment complexes. The topic of homeowner and condominium associations was also discussed and if approval would be granted. Ms. Krzic clarified that the text is written include duplexes, walk up flats, and stacked flats to have no more than one short term rental. The Arlo is considered a mixed use shopfront in the code and is not included in this section.

Mr. Greco wants to guarantee that the missing middle units such as duplexes and quadplexes are not able to be completely used as short term rentals since this was not the intent of allowing those units in the single family districts.

Ms. Cogburn noted that most apartment complexes do not allow you to sublease a unit, and you advised of this when you sign a lease. It was also noted through discussion that many condominiums may only allow a specific number of units. This could result in a first come, first serve situation. Ms. Krzic agreed that some association may consider this a business and not allow them at all.

Mr. Brambrut noted that he is not trying to belabor the topic but does believe that apartments and condominiums should not be so restricted.

Mr. Chilik stated that the intent is for there to be no more than one short term rental on each property to avoid there being multiple short term rentals and turning a building into a hotel type situation, which negatively impacts the neighbors.

Ms. Cogburn agreed and noted that this was a big topic of discussion and feedback that was received from the community. They did not want an excessive amount of short term rentals in their neighborhoods.

Mr. Brambrut stated that is why he is suggesting that the association of a condominium should have more short term rentals allows. Having one per building is too restrictive. The Commission continued to discuss the different types of buildings allowed. It was confirmed that the stacked flats are a full residential complex, unlike the Arlo, which is a mixed use building with commercial units on the ground floor and residential units above. That specific use can be found within commercial districts. Ms. Threadgill confirmed that stacked flats are permitted within the RM-18, RM-43, Professional Office, C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning districts.

Mr. McFarland went to the zoning map to look at and point out the zoning districts to the Commission. Mr. Friedlander does not want these units to be 100% short term rentals, but maybe a lesser value like 10 to 20% could be reasonable. It was confirmed again that the text only addresses duplexes, walk up flats, and stacked flats. Mr. McFarland continued to point out the districts on the zoning map and noted that the Commission could strike the stacked flats from the text. It was pointed out that there are few parcels where this type of housing is permitted. Ms. Threadgill appreciates the context that was shown upon the map. If stacked flats are to be stricken from the text, then the duplexes and walk up flats, which is the missing middle housing, is still protected from being overtaken by short term rentals.

Ms. Cogburn asked if there was any further discussion. Mr. Friedlander then asked if there was a decision on striking the stacked flats. Mr. McFarland stated it could be left in and he was merely pointing out where they were. Ms. Cogburn is also comfortable with leaving them in the text.

Ms. Cogburn reiterated the following agreed upon changes: 1.) change certified to designated; 2.) change the parking requirement to 0.5 spaces per guest room or sleeping room; and 3.) to add the provision that all existing short term rentals be brought into to compliance within 90 days of adoption.

A discussion concerning the amount of days that an owner had to bring the short term rental into compliance was discussed. It was thought that 90 days may be too quick. It was agreed that 120 days should be given. This will also allow adequate time for the City get notice out and process the applications.

Mr. Friedlander brought up the topic of not limiting the number of bedrooms. Mr. Greco thinks that the number should be limited, and Mr. McFarland agrees that we are walking into uncharted territory and being conservative may be best. Mr. Chilik pointed out that the ordinance still limits the number of occupants per bedroom and overnight guests. The discussion continued. Ms. Krzic confirmed that if an owner has a 5 bedroom home, it would not be permitting to be a short term rental. She noted that having

a maximum number was intentional when writing because the intent was to safeguard the neighbors from short term rentals that have too many people, too many cars, and activities occurring. That would not normally happen within a residential neighborhood. She noted that 4 rooms may not be the magic number. She researched listing online and drafted the code in a manner that was consistent with what was being posted online. Ms. Threadgill also noted that an owner would have the ability to apply for a variance. The discussion continued between the Commission members about what constituted a bedroom, fire safety concerns, especially within a basement, and rooms that could be considered game rooms. Ms. Threadgill recommended that the maximum of 4 guestrooms be removed, but still require that all guestrooms and sleeping rooms meet the building and fire codes. Then, all 2 person per guestroom or sleeping room, plus 2 additional person per property, or a maximum occupancy set by the Fire Marshal, that is up to but does not exceed a maximum of 10 people. The Commission agreed.

Ms. Cogburn restated the 3 changes identified above and added this occupancy change as number 4. Mr. McFarland wants to ensure that staff has the leniency to draft the language as needed. Ms. Cogburn called for a motion.

On a motion by Mr. Greco, seconded by Mr. Brambrut, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the text amendment to Article 6, 7, and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of short-term rentals and provide associated regulation and permitting standards with the following amendments:

- 1. Strike certified and replace with designated where appropriate concerning the property manager.*
- 2. Change the parking requirement to 0.5 per guest room or sleeping room, which will be rounded up accordingly.*
- 3. Add a section that discusses legacy rentals and that current operators must become compliant within 120 days.*
- 4. Strike the first sentence on line 22 about a maximum number of 4 guest rooms or sleeping rooms, and add language to line 26 that allows the Fire Marshal to set maximum occupancy that shall not exceed an overnight occupancy of 10 people.*

Mr. McFarland asked for a friendly amendment allowing staff the leniency to craft the language as needed. The vote was unanimous.

c. The Community & Economic Development Department is requesting text amendments to Article 6 and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of smoke, vape, and tobacco shops and provide associated regulation and permitting standards.

Representing the City of Decatur's Community & Economic Development Department, Ms. Krzic introduced the text amendment to Article 6 and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of smoke, vape, and tobacco shops and provide associated regulation and permitting standards. Highlighted items include:

Sec. 6.2. – Allowed Use Table	Add new commercial use of Smoke/ Vape/ Tobacco Store
-------------------------------	--

Sec. 6.5.11 – Retail Sales	Define Smoke/ Vape/ Tobacco Store, provide distance standards, how to measure such distances, and additional standards for such use
Sec. 12.1.1 – Defined Terms	Add new definitions

In a response to a question by Mr. McFarland, Ms. Krzic confirmed that other businesses are separated by the same distance requirements, such as personal care homes and other group living facilities. There are also distance requirements from other uses, such as day cares, churches, schools/ colleges, and MARTA Stations in the alcohol permitting license. The distances are measured in a similar manner. She further identified that the distance is measure to the front door or main entrance of the facility.

In a response to a question, Ms. Krzic confirmed that there are existing smoke/ vape/ tobacco businesses within the City and they would be protected under the non-conforming use regulations if there was a distance requirement that they could not meet.

In a response to a question by Mr. Friedlander, Ms. Krzic stated that she did use GIS mapping to designate the distances from the specific uses identified within the proposed text amendment. She began with larger distances and realized that they were too restrictive. The Commission continued to discuss that the measurement was as you walk between businesses and not “as the crow flies,” which will be a shorter distance.

In a response to a question by Mr. Brambrut, Ms. Krzic stated that a limited use was chosen instead of a conditional use permit, because the separation between uses was clearly defined within the proposed text amendment.

In a response to a question by Mr. Chilik, Ms. Krzic explained that the definitions were reviewed and modified by the City Attorney to ensure consistency with the State definitions and the method of delivery. Specifically, e-cigarettes are derived from the tobacco plant, delivered in an electric pipe/ vape, and inhaled into the body. He noted that the definition of tobacco paraphernalia is missing a comma and/ or proper punctuation and should be modified. Ms. Krzic agreed.

In a response to a question by Mr. Friedlander, Ms. Krzic confirmed that the use of a drive through in the C-2, C-3, and mixed use district are prohibited when they are used in correlation to the operation of a restaurant. Including this requirement was to ensure that it could not be used in correlation to smoke, vape/ tobacco stores.

Having no more questions, Ms. Cogburn opened public comment. She asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the application. No one came forth to speak, so she asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition of the application. No one came forth to speak. The public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Cogburn asked if there was any Commission discussion.

In a response to a question, Ms. Krzic confirmed that there are four (4) existing businesses that are considered to be smoke/ vape/ tobacco shops within the City. Since they are operating legally prior to this amendment to the code, they would be protected under the non-conforming regulations. She read the code as it relates to the continuance of such businesses. It reads as follows:

A nonconforming use or building shall not be:

1. Changed to another nonconforming use;
2. Reestablished after discontinuance for 1 year;
3. Extended except in conformity with this UDO;
4. Rebuilt, altered or repaired after damage by fire, windstorm or other disaster when damage exceeds 75% of the fair market sales value of the building immediately prior to the damage.
5. Prohibited from continuance as a result of a change in ownership.

A discussion occurred between the Commission in regard to tobacco being a legal product and that uses such as colleges and alcohol/ drug rehabilitation centers, which are defined within the distance setback requirements of the alcohol licensing, may not be critical to include in this amendment because they are adults over the age of 18 and suspect that these establishments have no smoking/ vaping policies.

Having no more discussion, Ms. Cogburn asked for a motion.

On a motion by Mr. Friedlander, seconded by Mr. McFarland, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the text amendment to Article 6 and 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to define the use of smoke, vape, and tobacco shops and provide associated regulation and permitting standards with the modification of the punctuation correction in the definition of tobacco paraphernalia. The vote was unanimous.

Other Business.

None

Next Regular Meeting. Due to a lack of items, the meeting on June 11 2024 will be cancelled. There is no regular meeting to be held in July; therefore, the next meeting will be August 13, 2024.

Adjournment. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:13 pm.

Consistent with the requirements of O.C.G.A. §50-14-1(e)(2)(B) these minutes were approved at the next regularly scheduled meeting on August 13, 2024 and made part of the record.

(DRAFT)

Kc Krzic
Planning & Zoning Manager
Acting Secretary to the Planning Commission