

Planning Commission Agenda
Minutes - March 9, 2026

1. Call to Order : Chairman Mehserle called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.
2. Roll Call: Chairman Mehserle; Commissioners Guidry, Ross, Shelton, Story, and Wharton were present. Commissioner Hayes was absent.

Staff: Joe Duffy – Community Development Director, Emily Carson – Community Planner, and Christine Sewell – Recording Clerk

Guests: Chad Bryant, Leonard Samples, James McGhee, and Logan Clark

3. Invocation- was given by Chairman Mehserle
4. Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2026, regular meeting, January 26, 2026, and February 09, 2026, work sessions

Commissioner Wharton motioned to approve the minutes of January 12, 2026; Commissioner Ross seconded; all in favor and were unanimously approved with Commissioner Story abstaining from vote.

Commissioner Wharton motioned to approve the minutes of January 26, 2026; Commissioner Ross seconded; all in favor and were unanimously approved with Commissioner Story abstaining from vote.

Commissioner Wharton motioned to approve the minutes of February 09, 2026; Commissioner Shelton seconded; all in favor and were unanimously approved.

5. Announcements - Chairman Mehserle referred to the notices as listed
 - Per O.C.G.A. 36-67A-3 if any opponent of a rezoning or annexation application has made campaign contributions and/or provided gifts totaling \$250 or more within the past two years to a local government official who will consider the application, the opponent must file a disclosure statement.
 - Policies and Procedures for Conducting Zoning Hearings are available at the entrance.
 - Please place phones in silent mode.
6. Citizens with Input – None
7. Old Business – None
8. New Business
 - A. Public Hearing (Planning Commission decision)

1.PLAT-0002-2026. Preliminary plat for The Harvest at AG Village on Moss Oak Road, Parcel No 0P0340 048000. The applicant is Chad Bryant, Bryant Engineering.

Mr. Duffy read the applicants' request, along with staff responses, which was for approval of a plat that subdivides a 153.51-acre parcel into 473 lots and is now referred to as Agricultural Village. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) was approved as the Perry Preserve in 2007. Mr. Duffy also noted the PUD requirements and advised staff was recommending approval of the plat as presented, provided full compliance of the adopted PUD Development Standards.

Chairman Mehserle requested confirmation the submittal meets all the requirements of the 2007 PUD; Mr. Duffy confirmed it does.

Chairman Mehserle opened the public hearing at 6:14pm and called for anyone in favor of the request. Mr. Chad Bryant – 111 Perimeter Road – the applicant, reiterated the request and had nothing further

to add. Chairman Mehserle called for anyone opposed; there being none, the public hearing was closed at 6:15pm.

Chairman Mehserle asked Mr. Bryant the width of the two-way streets and had the fire marshal reviewed. Mr. Bryant advised his client is electing not to take advantage of the PUD designation but intends to develop as an R-3, and most of the right-of-way is 60 feet, and the street widths are 27, and there have been no reductions. Chairman Mehserle asked if the development will be single-family homes and meet the open space requirements; Mr. Bryant advised it would, and development will be single-family in lieu of townhomes. Commissioner Guidry asked staff if one-way streets have a minimum width; Mr. Duffy advised they will be developed under the 2007 guidelines; Mr. Bryant advised there is an inner-traffic circle that is one way and will adhere accordingly to regulations.

Commissioner Wharton motioned to approve as submitted with the recommendation of staff for full compliance of the adopted PUD Development Standards; Commissioner Ross seconded; all in favor, and was unanimously approved.

2.VAR-0015-2026. Variance for reduction of front setbacks for 106 Prospect Ave, 110/112/114/116/118/120/122/124/126/128/130 Billboard Ave, 101/103/105/107/109/111 Ensemble Blvd, and 101/103/105 Billboard Ave. The applicant is Karen Rolle, Moore Bass Consulting.

Ms. Carson read the applicants' request, which was for a variance to reduce the front yard setback from 10' on varied lots within the residential portion of the current phase of the Encore PUD, along with staff responses. Ms. Carson advised the request is due to the inability to fit driveways of reasonable length on the lots with the current setback requirements.

Chairman Mehserle asked when the department reviewed and approved plans, was it indicated the setbacks would be adhered to and all units are served in the rear for parking; Ms. Carson confirmed yes.

Chairman Mehserle opened the public hearing at 6:24pm and called for anyone in favor of the request. Mr. Logan Clark with Moore Bass Consulting 112 Wes Park Drive, the applicant, advised there are 21 townhomes across five buildings and the goal is to maintain the building locations and functional driveways. The front porches were shown encroaching and were approved in architectural plans. The building will remain in the setbacks; the front porch awning encroaches not the structure itself. Several units previously constructed approved via administrative variance, goal is to keep driveways at 10 foot or greater; and pushing back will decrease that.

Chairman Mehserle called for anyone opposed; there being none the public hearing was closed at 6:27pm.

Commissioner Shelton asked if approved would it only be for the awning, and the driveway length would remain the same; Mr. Duffy advised that was correct. Mr. Clark advised if the awning has to be pushed back, the entire building will have to be pushed back and driveways shortened.

Commissioner Wharton asked if there had been any ordinance change that now requires an awning; Mr. Duffy advised there had not been. Commissioner Wharton asked if there has been any change with the lots that make up the PUD that would make it difficult to build on since it was adopted; Mr. Duffy advised based on a survey there could have been an error unknown to him and noted the previous director had allowed the concrete stoop but not the awning; Mr. Clark advised this was not specified on the civil plans. Commissioner Wharton acknowledged the standards were not a creation of the applicant, but they should have known all the requirements; Mr. Duffy advised the applicant was not the original developer of the property.

Ms. Carson advised there was an agreement between the former director and the previous applicant that played a role in how the development was laid out and that was adhered to, and she is stating for the record and that she was not in all the meetings but had been advised of this.

Shelton asked if the plans would have not been approved by the building official; Ms. Carson advised yes. Chairman Mehserle noted if it was unclear with regard to the overhang and the inspector measured it would not have been an oversight. Commissioner Wharton felt the builder created the scenario which violates the ordinance and is concerned with how the request can be approved based on that. Commissioner Story felt if they are adhering to the approved plan and not taking away how the awning affecting the setbacks. Chairman Mehserle to his understanding is that the architectural plans were approved, but the civil plans did not show the awning, and there was a lack of communication with the two submittals. Commissioner Wharton asked if what the city approved was in compliance and what was added was not; Ms. Carson advised that is correct. Chairman Mehserle asked if the units could be decreased to comply and Commissioner Story asked if the awning could be removed to comply; Ms. Carson advised neither could be done. Commissioner Wharton inquired about not granting any specific conditions; Mr. Duffy advised requests are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and he had spoken with Mr. Logan, and an administrative variance was granted for only two feet, anything greater would require a variance. Mr. Duffy advised there could be topographical issues with the parcel and not certain if the civil and building plans provided full details.

Commissioner Shelton asked when discovered in the process, as the completed units have awnings; Mr. Duffy advised approximately two months ago and noted the building inspector do not look at zoning compliance, and if this is a concern, it can be addressed.

Chairman Mehserle advised the ordinance represents the law adopted by the city for construction and is vacated if approved, and could possibly establish a precedent; therefore suggested the following options: 1). Approve, 2). Table, or 3). Approve the three units currently under construction and not allow the others.

Commissioner Guidry motioned to table for further information; Commissioner Ross seconded. Commissioner Shelton suggested exempt those currently under construction; Commissioner Wharton was opposed as it would set a precedent. Chairman Mehserle then called for vote on Commissioner's Guidry motioned to table with a second; all in favor with Commissioner Shelton and Story opposed; resulting 4 to 2 to table.

B. Informational Hearing (Planning Commission recommendation – Scheduled for public hearing before City Council on April 7, 2026)

1. **SUSE-0007-2026.** Special exception for short-term rental for property located at 1306 Keith Drive. The applicant is Leonard H. Samples.

Ms. Carson read the applicants' request, which was to offer the entire 3-bedrooms/2-bath house for short-term rental for a maximum of 6 occupants, along with staff responses. The premises were inspected for compliance with minimum health and safety requirements for use and occupancy (per Section 2-3.6) and passed.

Chairman Mehserle opened the public hearing at 6:55pm and called for anyone in favor the request. The applicant, Mr. Leonard Samples – 206 Brampton Way, reiterated the request, and wants to focus on visitors to the area. Chairman Mehserle called for anyone opposed; there being none the public hearing was closed at 6:56pm.

Commissioner Ross motioned to recommend approval to Mayor & Council of the application as submitted; Commissioner Wharton seconded; all in favor and was unanimously recommended for approval.

2.SUSE-0013-2026. Special exception for short-term rental for property located at 303 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. The applicant is James R. McGhee.

Ms. Carson read the applicants' request, which was to offer the entire 4-bedrooms/3-bath house for short-term rental for a maximum of 8 occupants, along with staff responses. The premises were inspected for compliance with minimum health and safety requirements for use and occupancy (per Section 2-3.6) and passed.

Chairman Mehserle opened the public hearing at 6:59pm and called for anyone in favor of the request. Mr. James McGhee, the applicant, reiterated the request and had nothing further to add. Chairman Mehserle called for anyone opposed; there being none the public hearing was closed at 7:00pm.

Commissioner Ross motioned to recommend approval to Mayor & Council of the application as submitted; Commissioner Shelton seconded; all in favor and was unanimously recommended for approval.

C. Other Business

D. Commission questions or comments – Commissioner Guidry inquired about covenants and restrictions; Ms. Carson advised these are homeowner associations regulations and the burden is on the applicant to advise.

E. Adjournment: there being no further business to come before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 7:04pm.