

TYRONE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

June 16, 2022 at 7:00 PM

Eric Dial, Mayor

Gloria Furr, Mayor Pro Tem, Post 4

Linda Howard, Post 1

Melissa Hill, Post 2

Billy Campbell, Post 3

Brandon Perkins, Town Manager

Dee Baker, Town Clerk

Dennis Davenport, Town Attorney

Attorney Dennis Davenport was absent

Also present was:

Rebecca Brock, Recreation Manager

April Spradlin, Court Clerk

Randy Mundy, Police Chief

Patty Newland, Library Supervisor

Patrick Stough, Town Attorney

Tracy Young, Fayette County Development Authority

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *The first public comment period is reserved for non-agenda items. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes. Please state your name & address. Comments that require a response may not be answered during this time. The Council or staff may respond at a later date.*

V. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made to approve the agenda.

Motion made by Council Member Furr, Seconded by Council Member Howard.

Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Campbell.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA: *All matters listed under this item are considered to be routine by the Town Council and will be enacted by one motion. There will not be separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the consent agenda and will be considered separately.*

1. Consideration to approve Council minutes from June 2, 2022.

A motion was made to approve the consent agenda.

Motion made by Council Member Campbell, Seconded by Council Member Hill.

Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Furr.

VII. PRESENTATIONS

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Consideration of a rezoning petition from applicant Teresa Shell for parcel 0736-021 at property address 458 Senoia Road from R-12 to C-1. **Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner**

Mr. Trocquet informed everyone that applicant Teresa Shell had applied for a rezoning of 458 Senoia Road from R-12 (Residential 1,200 s.f. min) to C-1 (Downtown Commercial). The stated intent of the rezoning was to accommodate a Montessori school/daycare at that property. The current configuration of structures on the property would accommodate C-1 development regulations and setback requirements without creating nonconformities. The barn on the north end of the property and the house both lie outside of the setback buffer.

He added that Ms. Shell applied for the same request in August of 2021. Planning Commission recommended approval of the request with the condition that a traffic study be performed. Town Council denied the petition. Before January of 2022, the character area for the property and all others west of Senoia Road was for Production and Employment consistent with development on that side of the road. Council determined that the future land use character area was not appropriate for the undeveloped or currently residential properties west of Senoia Road and thereby amended the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map following O.C.G.A standards in a public hearing.

Mr. Trocquet stated that the property was currently zoned R-12 Residential and the proposed rezoning was C-1 Commercial. The property currently held a vacant single-family residence. He shared that the property was surrounded by AR, C-2, R-12, and M-2 zoning categories and added that the property was approximately 2 acres.

He asked, would zoning permit suitable uses with surrounding properties? He shared that C-1 zoning was not explicitly permitted within the Estate Residential character area, however, C-1 zoning was compatible with commercial properties to the south. Land to the north, although zoned residential, was likely too narrow for the construction of a building. Commercial to residential buffers would be applied to the north and east of the property to protect residential properties within a certain proximity. The buffer was 75 feet long.

He posed, would Zoning adversely affect adjacent properties? He shared that the commercial properties to the south would not be adversely affected and would recapture buildable areas with the removal of a buffer requirement currently in place due to the current residential zoning of the property. The property would be subject to residential buffers to the north and east for adjacent owner protection and be required to submit a traffic impact analysis with a site plan if used for commercial purposes that require site improvements.

He posed, did the property have reasonable economic use as currently zoned? He stated that staff determined that the property did have reasonable economic use given its Future Land Use Character Area designation unless evidence to the contrary in the form of sale and occupancy records were reported to the Town due to site or other conditions. The applicant submitted an appraisal at a later time.

He then posed, would the proposed zoning result in a use that would or could be excessively burdensome on existing infrastructure? Staff determined that the zoning would not result in an excessive burden on existing infrastructure. Higher intensity commercial or industrial land uses exist along Senoia Road in that area of town. Lower-intensity commercial zoning would likely not overburden Senoia Road. Specific site considerations on traffic movement would be identified during the site planning portion of any further development for the property. Schools must provide a circular drive for pickup and drop-off which could be completed on that property given the preexisting curb cuts. If a traffic study yielded data suggesting an unacceptable impact on roads, the site plan would need to be adjusted until such impact was proven to be mitigated or resolved.

Mr. Trocquet shared that the property currently lies as a border property on the Future Land Use map between Production and Employment and the Estate Residential character areas. Situated within the Estate Residential Character area, the property would ideally assume residential zoning. The Future Development Map, however, was a guiding document with properties situated on the edge as potentially assuming a different zoning classification based on unique circumstances. Given that 458 Senoia Rd. bordered an already zoned C-2 property as well as a very active rail line, it was staff's opinion that C-1 (Commercial) or O-I (Office -Institutional) could be appropriate classifications since they would be considered transitional step-down zoning districts in terms of intensity. He added that light industrial was to the south and heavy industrial was directly to the south, and that property would ideally assume light industrial or office institutional. No additional commercial should go beyond that point.

Commercial zoning would also remove zoning buffers incurred on the C-2 property to the south that make it impractical to build on. Staff determined either residential or light commercial such as O-I (Office-Institutional) as appropriate zoning classifications for the property. Heavy Commercial or Industrial zoning would not be consistent for that property. Planning Commission recommended approval to rezone the property to O-I.

Council Member Howard stated that if the property was zoned O-I, there would be no guarantee that the use would be a school.

Mr. Trocquet agreed and stated that there was no guarantee, O-I had a litany of uses but the majority was for law offices, appraisers, and doctor offices, things of that nature. The more intense uses would be colleges or churches.

Mayor Dial explained that each side had ten minutes to speak, then the applicant would have their turn for rebuttal.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in favor of the rezoning.

Becky Salvanera stated that she had over 30 years of experience in child care and was a licensed director through the state and also through the Department of Early Learning. She added that she was currently the Director of the Kay Shell Montessori school in Newnan, she would also be the director of the Tyrone school. She stated that she had many years of safety experience, and the process for licensing was very vigorous. The state made two surprise visits a year to ensure safety standards. She added that the safety of the children was their top priority and that they always exceeded it. She looked

forward to working in Tyrone. She stated that a Montessori school was unique and that it gave children the independence to learn and developed their minds, bodies, and spirits to become leaders.

Catherine Sorenson stated that she was a resident of the area and that her children were currently enrolled at Kay Shell Montessori. She was confident that Ms. Salvanera would run the school better than anyone. It would be beneficial to have a Montessori school in the area. Everyone had a waiting list and the demand was very high for daycare facilities. She shared that there was no better option than to place a Montessori school on that property.

Jacquelyn Sheffield who lives on Wildwood Court shared that her child also attended the Kay Shell Montessori. She added that her child was a handful, but that the Kay Shell school worked wonders, she was now better behaved. Their school did not emphasize on profit, but on the child's development. Finding a place was very difficult, no one had availability in the area. It would be a blessing to have a location closer to home. They care more about the development of the whole child instead of making a profit.

Attorney, Newton Galloway spoke next on behalf of the applicant. He shared that he performed a lot of zoning work for governments and property owners. He stated that he agreed with staff's recommendation and that Mr. Trocquet's assessment was accurate. The property was vacant and it was a problem lot due to the railroad to the rear and Senoia Road in front and it had a unique shape. He disagreed with the statement that the property could be an estate residential property. It would essentially result in the demolition of the home and the barn. He addressed Council Member Howard's concern regarding once rezoned could there be a provision assuring that a school would be placed there. He clarified that Tyrone did not condition zonings in that matter. He stated that the Planning Commission was concerned about traffic issues. He then shared their traffic PowerPoint. He referenced the GDOT traffic assessment that was performed in February of this year on Senoia Road. He stated that the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) did not indicate a huge impact caused by the school, even during peak hours which would entail an additional 16 cars. He deferred to Ms. Salvanera's state requirements. He stated that heavy industry was to the south, the two tracts above probably had similar or worse development issues and the railroad tracks and Senoia Road would make all those lots difficult to develop as residential. The master appraiser of the property also agreed with the staff for the O-I rezoning.

Council Member Furr asked for a clarification regarding the additional 16 cars.

Mr. Galloway referred to the GDOT 48 -hour traffic study from January 31st to February 2nd of this year. It identified peak hours. The ITE study also indicated trips based upon uses of properties and square footage.

They estimated the morning peak at 8:00 am with 14 vehicles per hour and the afternoon peak at 5:00 pm with 14 vehicles per hour. He explained that the school would have two, afternoon pick-up times. He then shared that it was required that the school needed a circular drive with an entrance and an exit. The plan was to have 20 vehicles on the property, not on the road, and 8 spaces for staff and personnel.

Council Member Howard shared that the study was taken north of Dogwood Trail on Senoia Road, it did not consider the rock quarry traffic nor the McDuff Parkway traffic.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in opposition to the rezoning.

Gary Farr who lives on Senoia Road referred to a week-long study that he performed in front of the house. He reported that out of 49,844 cars, 76% were above the speed limit, 11,800 were at or below, and 4,843 were traveling up to 80 mph (56+). He added that there was a lot of commercial vehicle traffic. The Planning Commission spoke of initiating a four-way stop at Rockwood/Senoia/Crabapple Roads, which would not solve anything. He stated that the property was bought as residential, they knew what it was when it was purchased. If they had completed their research, they would have known why the previous property owner had not changed the zoning. Attorney Galloway even said that the property was a problem lot. If the piece of property meant so much to Ms. Shell, with the flowers and picket fence, why was the property not maintained? The grass had only been cut once since the last meeting.

Mindy Walding who lives on Senoia Road spoke next. She shared that it had been a residential property since 1962 and the residents had no issues with the location of the property. She stated that it was said that the land north of the property would never have a home on it. She added that the land belonged to Miss Barbara, Mr. Roberts' mother. That land had plans for a home for Miss Barbara in the future so her son could better take care of her. She added that there was a division between commercial, industrial, and residential, so why change that? There were currently nine commercial properties for sale or lease, why did they feel the need to buy a residential property? She stated that she had children and she needed to look after their safety, traffic would be added to that property. There was a school less than two miles away, those children would be dropped off and picked up around the same peak time. This would be a safety problem for us who bought our property as residential. I love Tyrone exactly like it is, when I bought my home, I embraced Tyrone. I did not buy my property to change it.

Mr. Jamie Roberts who lives on Senoia Road spoke next. He stated that he owned the surrounding land, the industrial park was located at the rear of his property, and Senoia Road was in the front. A lot beside him belonged to his brother and two lots in front were to be combined for his mother to build on. The entire family would be in one area. He shared that he had spoken many times regarding the issue and he preferred the rezoning not be approved.

Mr. Galloway was given a chance to rebut and to answer any questions. He shared that Ms. Shell did her research on the property and that according to the Town's Future Land Use Map, it indicated that her use was appropriate. She also inspected the property and its standards. He added that a lot of the opposition was tied to emotion. Ms. Shell proposed to preserve the history of the house.

She was planning on renovating the house and the barn. Once the property was out of the hands of the previous owner, they could have opposed the rezoning, however, Ms. Shell had property rights. He reiterated that she was planning on preserving the house and the barn and no new structures would be built.

Mayor Dial posed that Ms. Shell did her research but a person should research their zoning issues before purchasing property. Mr. Galloway stated that it was, however, the Town's Future Land Use Map that indicated Ms. Shell's use would be appropriate. The land-use classification was not compulsory. He stated that he did have an issue with Council changing the Land Use Map. When Ms. Shell came before Council initially, the use was appropriate. She did not purchase the property just to see what would happen.

Mayor Dial shared that the issue had plagued him for weeks and it was a difficult situation. He understood the concerns and he had some too. He then researched. He mentioned traffic and the safety of the children. He questioned why would anyone would want to place a Montessori school in that particular location. He cited the drop-off and pick-up driveway and asked how would cars not be within the roadway for oncoming dump trucks? He mentioned the railroad track behind the property, the need for fencing, and an acceleration and deceleration lane for added safety. All of those could have solutions. He stated that he had met with Mr. Trocquet and they went through the Town's ordinance. He shared that with O-I zoning, child care institutions, day nurseries and kindergartens were allowed as conditional uses. The conditions addressed most of his aforementioned concerns. He was still unclear about the number of students. He reiterated that he and Mr. Trocquet went through each condition and the conditions seemed to be obtainable, including the number of cars within the circular driveway during peak times.

Mayor Dial added that the research on the conditions, and the testimonials in favor and opposition were all appreciated, however, all did not carry much weight. What mattered most was that Council was there to vote on a zoning category. He shared an example of a rezoning vote that came back to haunt them. Although Council attempted to consider every scenario that would adversely affect folks, there may be another that was not considered. He shared that churches, amphitheaters, and assembly halls were also allowed within that space. Council tries to think ahead and ask, how would that use affect that area. With O-I, most uses would essentially be offices. He stated that they went through most listed uses to see if there could be a potential issue in the future, there were no glaring issues with uses or surrounding properties. The bottom line was, did that particular use fit that location?

Council Member Campbell agreed with Mayor Dial and added that Council had to consider, what would the use be in the future. He added that O-I was a softer category than the original request. C-1 uses would have been detrimental to the area.

He added that by rezoning the property to O-I, the property to the south would benefit from reduced setbacks. He stated that currently as a resident, it was an eyesore and had gotten worse, it was an undesirable location for a home. It may have been a nice location years ago, but not currently.

He informed everyone that Council was considering lowering the speed limit on most main roads perhaps by 10 mph, and Senoia Road was one of them. He shared that there would be a 4-way stop at the intersection of Senoia/Rockwood/Crabapple and suggested flashing school zone lights nearer to the school.

Mr. Trocquet stated that the traffic study recommended those changes, however, Council had not yet approved the changes. Council Member Campbell stated that traffic needed to be lowered throughout the entire Town, including some subdivisions. He restated what Mayor Dial said, a lot of thought had gone into deciding that particular rezoning.

Mayor Dial inquired about a minimum 4 ft. fence. Mr. Galloway clarified that the state required 4 ft, but the Town required 6ft. – 8 ft. fencing. Mayor Dial stated that the 6ft. -8 ft. fence should block the railroad entirely. Mr. Trocquet stated that the property owner could decide between 6ft. – 8ft. Council Member Hill inquired about the number of

children attending the school. Mr. Galloway replied from the audience and stated that it would depend on square footage, but approximately 25-30 students.

Council Member Howard asked for clarity that each classroom must have an exit for the playground. Mr. Galloway replied that the school had to comply with state and town regulations, they were not mutually exclusive and that was a regulation.

Mayor Dial discussed connecting the driveway to the barn driveway. Mr. Trocquet stated that it would be logical to combine them. Mayor Dial then inquired about additional parking spaces. Mr. Trocquet stated that according to the ordinance, the facility should have approximately 8-15 spaces depending on square footage. Mayor Dial asked Mr. Stough if Council could vote to change the speed limit that night? Mr. Stough said that he would need to refer to the Town's ordinance.

Council Member Campbell and Mr. Trocquet discussed the configuration of the property's circular driveway, buffers/setbacks, and additional parking. Mr. Trocquet shared that those details would be covered during the site plan phase and a traffic study.

Mayor Dial asked Chief Mundy for the process of changing the speed limit on Senoia Road, down to 30-35 mph. Chief Mundy shared that he was not fully aware of the entire process, however, changing the speed limit would only increase the fines travelers would pay. Officers could not spend all of their time in that one area, it was a straight-away which would typically be an area for drivers to accelerate. Mr. Stough shared that the ordinance stated that it was the Police Chief's responsibility in the past, but more research would be required to ensure that additional state requirements were not required. Chief Mundy added that a traffic study would also be required to see what speed that particular road would need to be. Mr. Trocquet reminded everyone that a traffic study was performed on Senoia Road for the 4-way stop at Rockwood Road.

That study may be used to determine what speed was needed and if a reduction was warranted. Mayor Dial added that they also may be able to determine if acceleration and deceleration lanes were needed. Mr. Trocquet also suggested, signage or flashing lights. Mayor Dial stated that although he respected Chief Mundy's opinion, that did not mean that the speed limit could not be changed. If people broke the speeding law, we should punish them.

Chief Mundy clarified that he was not saying to leave the speed limit the same but the speed limit sign was only as good as the police officer enforcing it. Council Member Campbell reminded everyone that golf carts may also be on the roads.

Council Member Howard referred to the zoning ordinance compatibility study. The question was, would the zoning adversely affect the adjoining properties. It mentioned commercial but not the surrounding residential properties. Mr. Trocquet clarified that the report mentioned buffers to the north and the east as protection to adjoining residential properties. Council Member Howard asked if that included the homes across the street? Mr. Trocquet added that a 75 ft. buffer would be required along with an 80 ft. setback on Senoia Road.

Council Member Howard stated that even though she appreciated the buffer and setback, it did not shield the view or the safety of the children. If the property was not safe for a residence, how could it be safe for a school? Council Member Furr added that

Mr. Gary Farr's study indicated 6,000 cars from 6 am – 7 pm one way and 80% of the cars were traveling 83 mph, which was devastating. She stated that his numbers were on target with POND's study at the 4-way stop. From 7 am – 7 pm, on Senoia Road, there were 6,898 vehicles traveling, although no speeds were given. She respected Mr. Farr's figures because that was his vocation. She stated that for a school to be located there with approximately 30 children, cement block trucks, and 18-wheelers traveling at high speeds was not ideal. She added that she sat along Senoia Road for 1 ½ hour to observe, it was horrible. She has lived in Tyrone her entire life and if a child were to get hurt it would be devastating. How could a school be placed where it was not suitable for a home, it's appalling? She added that the adjoining lot should signify the end of the commercial, and 458 Senoia Road should be the beginning of residential. Rezoning the property would not help, it would still have railroad tracks in the rear, and added traffic. The rezoning would assist with uses and conditional uses but not the traffic issue.

Council Member Campbell stated that he did not disagree with the traffic issue. He believed that the property should not be a residence nor a C-1 zoning. O-I was appropriate.

A motion was made to approve the rezoning of 458 Senoia Road from R-12 (Residential) to O-I (Office Institutional).

Motion made by Council Member Campbell, Seconded by Council Member Hill.
Voting Nay: Council Member Howard, Council Member Furr. Mayor Dial voted to approve the rezoning breaking the tie.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

3. Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2022/2023 Budget.

Sandy Beach, Finance Manager

Ms. Beach shared that there was a budget workshop on May 17th and a public hearing on June 2nd regarding the proposed budget for fiscal year 2022/2023.

Ms. Beach shared that nothing had changed since the public hearing and recommended adoption of the budget, which included miscellaneous funds.

A motion was made to adopt the fiscal year 2022/2023 General Fund budget of \$11,462,684.77 as well as the budget of \$8,298,018.61 for the other miscellaneous funds including sewer and SPLOST.

Motion made by Council Member Campbell, Seconded by Council Member Howard.
Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Furr.

X. NEW BUSINESS

4. Consideration to Award Task Order 5: Swanson Road – Share the Road Study. Project No: PW-2022-08 of 2021 Transportation Engineering Services project to POND, Inc.

Scott Langford, Town Engineer / Public Works Director

Mr. Langford stated that upon approval of the budget for FY22/23, the Swanson Road – Share the Road Study, Project # PW2022-08 was under consideration to be awarded to POND, Inc. The project was part of the 2017 SPLOST to provide bike and cart travel on Swanson Road. He added that Swanson Road was designated as a “No Thru Truck” road and had a posted speed limit of 25 MPH. It would also investigate the use of physical and passive traffic calming devices. Mr. Langford stated that staff recommended approval. He added that the project would begin after July 1, when the new budget would be in effect. Council Member Campbell asked if the project was in the budget. Mr. Langford stated that it was a part of the 2017 SLOST.

A motion was made to award Task Order 5: Swanson Road – Share the Road Study, Project No: PW2022-08 to POND, Inc. for \$19,217.50.

Motion made by Council Member Campbell, Seconded by Council Member Hill.
Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Furr.

5. Consideration to approve Change Order 1 to the 2022 Asphalt Resurfacing Project (PW-2022-05). **Scott Langford, Town Engineer / Public Works Director**

Mr. Langford shared that the 2022 Asphalt Resurfacing project (PW-2022-05) was awarded on May 25, 2022. It was under construction and was approved by Council. He shared that the River Crest HOA wished for staff to look at the entrance on Laurelmont and Hwy 74 near the flag pole. Initially, he was skeptical to add that section due to no returned bids at that time. Piedmont Paving’s bid came in \$9,000 under budget.

According to the pavement condition index (PCI), the entire road would not be ready to pave for another 4-5 years. The condition in that area is very poor with severe cracking. He contacted the contractor since the equipment would be less than 1,000 feet away to add that section. The milling cost would be higher due to the area in question not being a straight line. However, the repair would be less expensive due to the equipment being nearby leaving no need to mobilize.

Council Member Campbell inquired if the contractor could research the problem area in front of the clubhouse due to heavy equipment and delivery trucks. Mr. Langford shared that a portion of Stonewyck, Park Haven, and Laurelmont was within the project. Those intersections would also be paved.

A motion was made to move forward with Piedmont Paving, Inc. Change Order 1 to repair a small section of asphalt paving at the entrance to the River Crest subdivision for an amount of \$25,358.70.

Motion made by Council Member Hill, Seconded by Council Member Campbell.
Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Furr.

6. Consideration to adopt a fee schedule for Town Code Enforcement violations.

Katherine Crouch, Permit & Compliance Specialist

Mr. Trocquet shared that he would present but that Ms. Crouch had performed an excellent job of preparing the fee schedule. He stated that the report included code sections, descriptions, fees, and recommended changes along with other municipality cost comparisons. This was a portion of a larger project that would extract most current

fees that were codified within the ordinances. By extracting them, they would be placed within a full schedule of fees that would reference each ordinance. The code enforcement violations would be the first amendment to the overall fee schedule.

Mr. Trocquet explained that staff had been operating under an out-of-date fee schedule making it difficult for the Judge if a case went to court. He stated that 99% of violations never made it to court. They were solved through staff communication. The fees were not meant to be a source of revenue; however, consistency was required.

Council Member Howard asked which ordinance and fee included parking on grass in a residential area. Mr. Trocquet shared that it was in section 113.211 with a fee of \$175. He added that the term was generic. He explained that for residential zoning, most septic tanks were located in the front yard, this would prevent damage to the septic line. It was also for aesthetic concerns so cars would not pile up in front yards.

Council Member Howard shared that Council would need to take a closer look at the ordinances, she was not prepared to vote that night. Council Member Hill inquired about parking trucks in residential areas. Mr. Trocquet explained that commercial vehicles over a certain weight, especially 18-wheelers were not allowed in residential zonings.

Council Member Howard shared that the ordinances had been on the books for a long time and had not been enforced. Citizens needed to have a better understanding for what was being purposed. She echoed Mr. Trocquet that 99% of violations were not charged, she needed to know what was being proposed in case citizens were to contact her. Council Member Hill suggested voting on the fee schedule with the opportunity to change it later. Council Member Howard did not agree.

Council Member Campbell shared that he was in favor of what staff was proposing, but agreed with Council Member Howard.

There had been many violations for many years, citizens would need to be made aware. He mentioned the Citizens Academy class that Mr. Perkins proposed recently or a mailer. He understood that letters and phone calls were also being made. Council Member Furr agreed.

Mr. Stough explained that not adopting the fee schedule did not mean that the ordinances would not be enforced. Adopting the fee schedule gave the Judge a solid reference if cases were to go to court. Council Member Howard reiterated that 99% did not make it to court.

Council Member Howard stated that Council should not set fees if they had not decided to maintain all of the ordinances.

Mr. Trocquet explained that no violations on the list were new, they had been codified within the Town's ordinance. The listing would be a good exercise for Council to review if they felt that some should be repealed. Staff would take direction if Council felt that some were not in the best interest of the public. He restated that all of the listed violations were within the original citations within the code of ordinances that were adopted. He added that staff would take Council's direction and suggested either adopting the fee schedule or revisiting the item and perhaps repealing ordinances that they wished to repeal at a later date. He added that staff was not necessarily looking for

violations but if someone brought something to their attention because they were on the books they needed to be upheld.

Council Member Howard asked if the violations were in a book for review. Mr. Trocquet stated that they were all located within the Town's code of ordinances. He added that the spreadsheet before them would be a good reference. He suggested referencing the online code and to input the reference number and it would take them directly to that section so they could read the entire narrative.

Council Member Howard inquired about section 26.67, Attractive Nuisances. Mr. Trocquet explained that if a vacant home or commercial building had broken windows or open doors, it attracted children to walk through, which could end in harm to the child.

Council Member Howard stated that she would like to see the ordinances so she could read through them. Mr. Trocquet stated that staff could highlight some and place them within a staff report.

Mr. Trocquet stated that it was a pressing issue that would benefit the town. He added that staff would put together a version of the report that included the code for Council's examination next week.

A motion was made to table the Code Enforcement Fee Schedule for the July 21, 2022, Council meeting.

Motion made by Council Member Howard, Seconded by Council Member Furr.
Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Campbell.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *The second public comment period is for any issue. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes. Please state your name & address. Comments that require a response may not be answered during this time. The Council or staff may respond at a later date.*

XII. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Langford stated from the audience that the chipper had arrived.

XIII. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council Member Furr asked Mr. Langford to please take care of the Public Works staff that had to work in the heat. He stated that he would.

Council Member Campbell shared that the Downtown Development Authority's, First Friday event at Shamrock Park was successful. It included a band and food trucks. The next event would be on Friday, July 1st, and would include the showing of a movie. The next two first Friday would be in August and September. He invited everyone to attend.

XIV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 pm.

Motion made by Council Member Howard.

Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Campbell, Council Member Furr.

By: _____
Eric Dial, Mayor

Attest: _____
Dee Baker, Town Clerk