

City of Sugar Hill Council Meeting
Monday February 11, 2002
7:30 PM Community Center

The City of Sugar Hill Council held its regular Council Meeting on Monday February 11, 2002 at 7:30 PM in the Community Center.

Notice of the meeting was placed on the doors of city hall and the community center. Notice was placed on the board at Peachtree Industrial Blvd and Alton Tucker Blvd. Notice was also sent to the local newspapers.

Those present at the meeting included Mayor Gary Pirkle, Mayor Pro-Tem Kim Hall, Council Members Chris Abbey, Meg Avery, Ron Johnson and Thomas Rhodes. Also present were City Attorney Lee Thompson, City Manager Bob Hail, and Assistant City Manager for Development Jim Osborn and City Clerk Shirley Gibbs.

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:

Mayor Pirkle called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

INVOCATION:

Pastor Arthur Southerland, of West Buford Baptist Church, gave the Invocation.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Council Member Abbey made the motion to approve the agenda. Council Member Rhodes made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

APPROVAL OF THE 01/14/2002 MINUTES:

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to approve the 01/14/2002 minutes as printed. Council Member Avery made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

THERE WAS NO OLD BUSINESS

CITIZENS AND GUESTS COMMENTS:

Barry Shaw of Princeton Oaks Subdivision was there with the President of the Homeowners Association. They were concerned about some of the homes in the neighborhood that seemed to be running boarding houses. He understood that this was not supposed to be possible in a single-family home. He had talked with the Planning Department and was told letters would be sent out and so far he had seen no change. He knew one of the houses had a family living in the basement and there were three to five single males that came and went. They also parked their cars on the grass. He was very concerned about this and would like to have this matter taken care of. Mayor Pirkle asked him to leave his name with Jim Osborn and City Manager Bob Hail so they could check into this matter.

Glen Wendt, a candidate for the State House Seat 85 formally held by Bobby Reese, told the council members and audience that the Special Election would be held in two weeks. He is a conservative Republican and would appreciate their vote. He would be glad to

City of Sugar Hill Council Meeting
Monday February 11, 2002
7:30 PM Community Center

answer any questions from the public after the meeting. Mayor Pirkle told the audience that this was an open time and in no way meant that the council was for or against any of the candidates.

Council Member Ron Johnson wanted to congratulate Officer McGrath and Officer DePaula. He felt they had been doing a great job.

NEW BUSINESS:

**A: SWEAR IN ED SCHOECK POST #4 ON THE APPEALS BOARD
TERM TO EXPIRE 12/31/2002:**

Mr. Schoeck was not available to be sworn in.

**B: CLARIFY ORDINANCE FOR APPOINTMENT AND TENURE
OF BOARD MEMBERS:**

City Manager Bob Hail explained this ordinance had been passed but there was some confusion on the terms. In an attempt to get all the board members on the correct schedule, they had been assigned post numbers and a three-year term limit. If a board member were to resign, their replacement's term would expire for that post number. Also, the Alcohol Review Board Members were all set to expire in July of this year. He had assigned them post numbers as well with expiration dates. Council Member Avery made the motion to approve these terms and expiration dates. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

**C: PUBLIC HEARING RZ-01-005: The Myrick Co is requesting to
Rezone 25.13 acres at Peachtree Industrial Blvd. The property is
Currently zoned HM-1 (Light Industry District) zoning classification
And the applicant requests a BG (General Business District) zoning
Classification:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made a motion to hear this zoning and the next zoning RZ-01-004, the Myrick Co requesting to rezone 45.53 acres from HM-1 to RM are related, be heard together if the applicant had no objections and to increase rebuttal time for both sessions. She asked Mr. Dillard, who was there on behalf of the applicant, if he had any objection. Mr. Dillard replied they had attempted to file them together but the zoning classification would not allow it but he felt it was appropriate to hear them together. Mayor Pirkle asked City Attorney Thompson for a point of order, since the agenda had already been approved would a unanimous vote be necessary to approve hearing these two items together. Mr. Thompson replied that Mayor Pirkle was the presiding officer and he would not view it as an agenda amendment but rather combining two items for one Public Hearing. Mayor Pirkle asked if that was one Public Hearing but two separate items; to which Mr. Thompson responded that would depend on how the motion was made. Based on what Mayor Pro-Tem Hall had said he assumed she would make a motion for the combined zoning as well. Mayor Pirkle wanted to know if it did not take a unanimous vote to change the agenda. City Attorney Thompson replied that it would take a unanimous vote to change the agenda but they were not changing it merely combining two items into one Public Hearing. Council Member Abbey made the second

City of Sugar Hill Council Meeting
Monday February 11, 2002
7:30 PM Community Center

to Mayor Pro-Tem Hall's motion to combine RZ-01-005 and RZ-01-004. Council Member Avery wanted to be clear, if it was one Public Hearing was there going to be one vote or would there be one vote for RZ-01-005 and one vote for RZ-01-004. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall replied that her motion was for both items to be considered together and there would be one vote. Council Member Avery then asked City Attorney Thompson what would be the legal advantage for doing this for this particular zoning or would there be an advantage. Mr. Thompson replied he did not think there would be a legal advantage or a disadvantage to hearing both at once; the issue would be could they do that. The council can do this if the majority of the council desires to do this and he assumed the reason Mayor Pro-Tem Hall wanted to hear both at once would be conditions placed on the zonings that would tie both zonings together. If they intend to address the zonings separately and not have joint conditions he would see no reason or purpose for doing that but if they were going to have joint conditions where as a condition of zoning, for example, before they could do something on the second parcel they would have to do something on the first parcel. Or if they have a condition that combines both pieces together and one condition then they might want to address it that way. Council Member Abbey stated he was curious why Mayor Pro-Tem Hall wanted to hear them together when they came through the Planning and Zoning Commission as separate items and have been on the agenda as separate items. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall replied that in looking at both items they are pretty much inextricably linked and as Mr. Thompson has said she is interested in possibly setting some conditions on one that would be incumbent upon doing something on one part, for example, the BG Zoning relative to the other zoning, the RM Zoning and you can not do that if you zone them separately. Council Member Abbey stated that you could put conditions on either one individually if that is she wanted to do. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall replied that you could not tell them to build out 100% of the BG Zoning before he started on the apartments, as part of the zoning. If it were two separate parcels the council would not be able to put those kinds of conditions on the zoning and if the applicant was willing to let the council view them as one she saw that as an advantage for the council. Council Member Johnson commented that Mayor Pro-Tem Hall was trying to say that the applicant could not build out all the apartments and town homes without building the retail section. He would have to build some of the retail and some of the apartments or town homes if that were the conditions placed on the zoning. Council Member Abbey commented that he understood what she was saying but currently the city did not have a mixed use zoning classification and he felt that this is what hearing the two as one item would create. Mayor Pirkle called for the vote on the motion to hear both items at the same time. The vote was 2-2-1, Hall and Johnson was for the motion, Abbey and Avery were opposed and Rhodes abstained. Motion failed. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to enter Public Hearing for RZ-01-005 the Myrick Company requesting to rezone 25.13 acres from HM-1 to BG. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0. Mayor Pirkle explained the way it would be conducted; Mr. Osborn would be allowed to explain the rezoning request, the applicant would be given time to respond and then the public would be given the opportunity to speak. Mr. Osborn explained that RZ-01-005 was currently zoned HM-1 Light Industrial. The applicant is requesting to rezone to BG General Business District. He went on to explain that the one tract is 24.45 acres and the applicant is proposing to

develop it as retail and office space. The applicant is proposing to develop a commercial and office village with out parcels along the front and sides and will total 300,000 square feet or 12,000 square feet per acre. The subject parcel fronts Peachtree Industrial along the north which is zoned LM, to the south zoning is HM-1 which is the current right of way purchased by the Georgia SOT for the proposed Northern Arc and to the west is Mr. Breedlove's property which is part in and part out of the city limits, zoning R75. To the northwest is Brookside at Parkview, a single-family subdivision currently zoned RS100 in the city. The Comprehensive Plan calls for these 70.65 acres to be classified as commercial, light industrial. The zoning classification of General Business would be in keeping with developing this corridor as commercial or industrial. As will be heard in a separate zoning issue, the applicant is proposing to incorporate the multi family zoning tract and is intending to incorporate and merge the two as one but separately. In attempting to merge the two, typically there is a 75-foot buffer between the General Business and the RM residential. What the applicant is asking for is to reduce that buffer to zero feet and merge these two. The Planning Commission approved this with a vote of 5-0 with the following conditions: 1- Reduce the required 75 foot buffer between the proposed BG and RM zoning tracts to zero feet. 2- Provide five (5) foot wide sidewalks along the entire frontage of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and four (4) foot wide sidewalks along the interior streets (through out) the BG tract. 3- All buildings shall be finished with architectural treatments of glass and/or brick, stone, stucco, or submit alternate architectural plans for approval prior to issuance of a building permit. 4-Pitched roofs are encouraged but will not be required for all buildings. Variations other than pitched roofs will be submitted to the city for review and approval. 5-In off-street parking lots, landscaped islands consisting of a minimum area of 75 square feet per island shall be provided per every 15 double row parking spaces. Landscape islands shall be planted with at least one tree not less than six (6) feet in height at the time of planting and shall be suitable to this region. 6-All trash dumpsters shall be screened by an enclosure using the same exterior building material as the adjacent occupied buildings. Pickup shall be limited between the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM. 7-No outdoor storage of any materials associated with the commercial use shall be permitted on site. 8-Lighting shall be of a sodium type, contained in cut-off type luminaries and shall be directed in towards the property so as not to reflect into adjacent residential properties. Any other lighting shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Office for approval. 9-Outdoor speakers shall be prohibited. 10- The following uses shall be prohibited: automotive sales/service repair lots and associated facilities, boarding and rooming houses, car washes, moving van or truck rental facilities, motels/hotels, parking garages, taxi/limousine service and transportation terminals for passengers. Another condition placed by the Zoning Commission was: Before any construction development could begin the site development plan should be in accordance with and document all conditions placed on the property and shall be approved by the City Council. This will include the Zoning Ordinance Regulations, conditions of zoning, development regulations required by the city. In other words, what they approve tonight, basically they have to stick to that and any substantial deviation from that would be determined by the Planning Director. If it is deemed as a substantial deviation it would have to come back before the city council for approval. No development shall begin until a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

recognized water flood plain study has been completed and submitted to the city. The Director will approve which water study is acceptable. Staff recommendation was for approval. The Planning Commission approved it 5-0. Doug Dillard of Dillard and Galloway was there on behalf of the applicant. He wanted to state at the outset that in response to Mayor Pro-Tem Hall's motion to consolidate both hearings, this was really filed as one project. The only reason it was not filed under one zoning classification; Sugar Hill does not have a mixed use zoning classification so they filed it as two separate applications. However, they were not interested in developing the retail center without the residential. As he understood the separation of the two hearings, they were now hearing the BG application. They would ask that the Council have the hearing but reserve their vote until such time they determine whether or not they were going to approve the apartments. He feels the council can do this; they can vote on the apartments then come back and vote on the business. The property has no value to them if it is not one project. It has no value to them to have business and retail fronting on Peachtree Industrial and then have industrial next to the residents. They have tried to market this property as industrial for seven or eight years, nobody is going to build industrial on this property in his opinion. They would ask that the council conduct the Public Hearing but reserve their vote on the business center (BG) until such time as they make a decision on the apartments. He felt it was consistent with the staff recommendation but also consistent with the overall plan, its design and the way this property has really been hurt. He was going to let Mr. Myrick make some comments regarding the conditions for the BG. They really had few comments on those conditions but Mr. Myrick did want to point out one or two things to the council. He did want to say though that as it relates to both the apartments and to the BG Zoning, the staff has basically found it is consistent with the intent of the ordinance, it is consistent with the Comprehensive Principals of Planning and Policies set by the city. They would just say that on page two where the staff has said does the property for which the rezoning is requested have a reasonable economic value as currently zoned. The staff has said yes but they submit to the council that it does not have a reasonable economic value under the industrial classification they would object to that. Other than that he thought that the presentation by the staff was basically adequate as it relates to the Comprehensive Planning Principals. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall asked Mr. Dillard that in asking the council to hold off their vote for the BG tract, 25.13 acres, he was indicating that if they were to negatively zone the remainder of the property, the 45.53 acres, he would then be looking to withdraw the application for the BG Zoning. He replied that no he would not, if they were to vote down the apartments then they would like for the council to vote down all of it and they would let a Judge decide. What they would hope would be for the council to approve some reasonable residential use on the property as staff had recommended and if that is passed then they can come back and vote on the business because what was being done here was conducting a Public Hearing on each of the applications. In as much as the conditions suggested by staff was concerned, they had no objections relative to the mall entrance and others because they do tie together and it would be more appropriate to impose them on the BG property. Mr. Dick Myrick said the reason they came split the first time, the Planning Commission had asked if the owner would want one without the other and he did not know how to answer that. He had discussed it at length with Mr. Starke, the

owner of the property, and he will not proceed on any part of the BG land if the RM land is not rezoned. His preference would be for the council to turn them both down. He would probably prefer one vote to two votes but he is not going to proceed with the front portion until he knows what he is going to do with the back portion. Having said that he would talk about the conditions on the BG property, although that was awkward because the conditions assume the joint development in many ways, the shared entrance, the entrance mall. They will not build the entrance mall before the offices. Responding to the specific conditions, they had no problem with numbers one, two, three and four. With respect to number five – Off Street Parking – they would request that they have the 75 foot island every twenty (20) double row parking spaces instead of fifteen (15). Regarding number six (6) – Dumpsters – they would prefer that the enclosure material be architecturally similar. They had no problem with numbers seven, eight or nine. On number ten they would ask that the council prohibit coin operated car washes, if they were able to have a full staff to do detail they would like to be able to do that.. With respect to number twelve, to the extent that they approve both plans, they have no problem but if they do not approve the apartments, they have a significant objection to the current site plan because it was all one site plan and that may not be what they choose to do. If it is going to be BG by itself, they would ask that it simply be BG and if they submit a plan to staff for approval at a later date that would be fine. He also did not think, with respect to number thirteen (13), that with regard to the BG portion, that they do a flood plain study; flood plains would have more to do with the RM portion. If they approve both they have no problem with that condition. They have no problem with number fourteen (14) if both the BG and RM are approved. They have been a quality developer in Gwinnett County for a long time and are looking forward to this project. Making the BG project work means putting some rooftops on Peachtree Industrial Blvd. There is not a lot of housing on PIB until you get well south of McGinnis Ferry Road. They feel this RM project is good support for the BG and without it the BG and OI are probably some years off. Council Member Johnson asked why they would want to change condition number five (5) to 20 instead of 15. Mr. Myrick explained it was a slightly smaller number of islands. With every 15 double row of parking spaces, it runs the islands together a little bit and starts to impact the number of parking spaces you have. Council Member Abbey asked about number ten (10) and prohibiting coin operated car washes when either the P&Z or staff had recommended prohibiting hotels and motels, did they have a problem with that. Mr. Myrick said they did not and that was included on page two. There were no comments from the public. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to exit Public Hearing and return to regular session. Council Member Johnson made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0. Mayor Pirkle wanted to clarify with Mr. Thompson if they had to take a vote at this time. Mr. Thompson explained they had held the Public Hearing so they could vote now or delay it. Council Member Abbey made a motion to grant the applicants request and delay the vote until they had made a decision on the residential rezoning. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0. After the Public Hearing for RZ-01-004 and on a 3-2 vote to deny that rezoning, the council took action on this item. Council Member Rhodes made the motion to approve the rezoning for RZ-01-005 subject to all the conditions. Council Member Abbey made the second for the purpose of discussion.

With regards to the conditions for the dumpster enclosure being built of the same building material as the surrounding structures. Mr. Myrick had indicated that they would like to use something that was aesthetically pleasing but not necessarily the same building material. He asked if Council Member Rhodes would be open to amending his motion. Council Member Rhodes amended his motion and Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

D: PUBLIC HEARING RZ-01-004: The Myrick Co is requesting to Rezone 45.53 acres at Peachtree Industrial Blvd. The property Is currently zoned HM-1 (Light Industry District) zoning classification And the applicant request a RM (Multi-Family Residential District) Zoning classification:

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to enter Public Hearing for RZ-01-004. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0. Mr. Osborn explained this land is also currently zoned HM-1 and currently classified as industrial on the Comprehensive Plan. There is 46.2 acres and the applicant is proposing to construct 292 apartment units and 28 fee simple town homes. The applicant is attempting to make this a transitional land use between the General Business and the single-family subdivision behind this property and adjacent to Mr. Breedlove's property trying to increase the interconnectivity, so to speak, between these two and the pedestrian liability between the two uses. There is now approximately 300 feet between the rear lot line of Brookside at Parkview and what is now a town home structure. That will probably remain undeveloped due to its proximity to the flood plain. With the buffer requirements, the flood plain and Level Creek nearby, it would be difficult to develop this area. Thirty three percent of the tract will be left as green space, three detentions ponds will be located in the proposed RM tract and there is a proposed nature path that wraps around the outside of the project. In the original application, the applicant was proposing to reduce the required one bedroom square footage to 650 square feet and also have a three/four story split. That means three stories on the front elevation and four stories on the back elevation. Sugar Hill's current zoning ordinance does not allow for 650 square foot apartments, which would have to be taken up through a text amendment. There were several ways to address the height restrictions. They could approve anything higher than two stories as a condition of zoning. Other ways to address the height restriction included the Zoning Board of Appeals, Special Use Permit or text amendment. The Planning Commission rejected this zoning by a vote of 3-2. The staff recommendation was for approval to rezone from HM-1 to RM with the following conditions: (1) the number of apartments will not exceed 250, (2) the town homes will not exceed 30, (3) that there will be a mandatory Homeowners Association with covenants for the town homes and the apartments; which will not allow vehicles to park on the street. (4) Town homes will be owner occupied except in emergency situations. (5) The exterior of all town homes and apartments will consist of at least 50% front, side and rear brick, stone or stucco. (6) That the apartments will not exceed two stories in height except where the topography allows for a two/three split with the front elevation being two stories. In this case, living units will be allowed on the bottom floor. (7) A two hundred foot undisturbed vegetative buffer shall be maintained along the western property line and that will be maintained within 800 feet of any existing structures. (8) The nature path shall

not be built within 150 feet of Mr. Breedlove's property line and it shall be at least five (5) feet wide pervious surface. The next condition was also site specific, if this rezoning is approved, it could not deviate from the approved site plan and the Planning Director would determine what that deviation was. If that were to occur, it would have to come back before the Mayor and Council. Also the detention would be oversized, the exterior lights could not shine on adjacent property. A FEMA study, recognized by FEMA, would have to be done prior to the issuance of any development permits. Mayor Pirkle asked about the difference in the plan present at the Planning Commission meeting and the plan presented at this meeting. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall asked about the difference in acreage on the agenda and what Mr. Osborn had been talking about. Mr. Osborn explained it was actually 46.20 acres. Council Member Johnson asked about the distance from the town homes and the back of the existing subdivision. Mr. Doug Dillard representing the applicant gave his presentation on the RM property. He presented statistics showing that apartments did not increase crime, did not bring down property value and did not overburden schools or increase traffic. What they were striving to do was build a community, not a subdivision. They were striving to build a place to live, shop and work. Mr. Myrick gave his presentation on the site plan and they were willing to live with all the conditions but two; the number of town homes and the two/three split. Council Member Abbey asked about the number of apartments and the number of town homes. Mr. Myrick responded that this plan shows 270 but they have agreed to staff's recommendation of 250 apartments and that the town homes be increased to 42. Council Member Abbey then asked about the density, which falls within the Sugar Hill guidelines. He asked about the three/four split they were requesting and the square footage of the one bedroom apartment. Members of the Public speaking against the approval of this development included: Dennis Duncan, Rena Eureka, Norval Walter, Alan Brooks, Jim Tuholski, and Jim Sands. Mr. Dillard addressed his rebuttal regarding the concerns of those speaking against this project. Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to close Public Hearing on RZ-01-004. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0. Council Member Abbey made the motion with regards to rezoning RZ-01-004 that the council deny it. Council Member Rhodes made the second. Motion passed on a vote of 3-2. Council Members Hall and Johnson were opposed.

**E: PUBLIC HEARING: PACER FUEL APPLICATION FOR RETAIL
SALE OF BEER AT 4725 NELSON BROGDON BLVD fka SAM'S INC.:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall stated that there were several inconsistencies with the application, the background check had not been made for all the personnel involved with the operation of this business. She made a motion to table this item until this could be taken care of. Council Member Johnson made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

F: GMA LEASE POOL AGREEMENT:

City Manager Hail explained this was an annual agreement with GMA for the leasing of equipment and vehicles the city is currently using not for new purchases. Council Member Rhodes made the motion to allow the City Manager to sign the necessary paperwork for the GMA Lease Pool Agreement. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

City of Sugar Hill Council Meeting
Monday February 11, 2002
7:30 PM Community Center

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT: No Public Report

COUNCIL REPORTS:

Council Member Rhodes reported he would be looking into the possibility of having a Public Hearing on the Northern Arc.

Council Member Avery reported that the council had a work session earlier this month. One of the things discussed was the garbage contract. There would be a Public Hearing on Monday February 25, 2002 at 8:00 PM for input on the garbage service. There would be another one on Saturday March 2, 2002 at 10:00 AM for input on the garbage service.

Council Member Abbey reported that Tuesday February 12, was an election day. Polls were open from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. He encouraged everyone to go vote.

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall had no report.

Council Member Johnson wanted to thank the people who had remained for the entire council meeting.

MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor Pirkle also mentioned the trash hearings. He did want to mention that they were letting out for bids on the Town Green. There would be some trees, green space, and a gazebo, a Veterans Memorial.

CITY CLERK'S REPORT: No Report.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

City Manager Hail gave the following report: On February 25th at 8PM and March 2nd at 10 AM, Sugar Hill would hold Public Hearings addressing future sanitation collection for city residents. The current sanitation contract expires on June 30, 2002. Citizen input is requested on possible collection options: bags, roll-off cans, recycling and/or combinations. A summary of the 2001 road improvements is posted on the City's Website, www.cityofsugarhill.com. The proposed streets to be improved in 2002 is also listed. On February 4th there was a Town Hall meeting to discuss the project to improve Spring Hill Drive. There were 17 attendees and 18 who were unable to attend but did return their survey. The majority (69%) preferred the option where Spring Hill Drive was two-way between Whitehead and Old Spring Way and one-way the rest of the way to Level Creek. This option also included a sidewalk the entire length connecting Whitehead to Level Creek. They were now talking to the residents who would be most affected by the road widening. The sidewalk connecting Highway 20 to Peachtree Industrial Blvd along West Broad Street was complete. The Parkview Drive access to EE Robinson Park had been closed. This was done for safety and to control after hour's access to the park. A sidewalk installed for park access from the Parkview Subdivision and will connect with the lower restroom/pavilion building and should be finished by the end of February. The City has requested bids to design the Town Green and is looking into the possibility of constructing an amphitheater below the pavilion at EE Robinson Park. Final design and cost estimates will determine project feasibility and construction. Sugar Hill gas price per therm for December and January was \$. 77. They are now investigating and purchasing next winter's gas futures to ensure an even lower per therm rate. So far this year, the city has replaced and/or expanded the main gas lines by over 3,000 feet to improve service and allow for growth.

City of Sugar Hill Council Meeting
Monday February 11, 2002
7:30 PM Community Center

EXECUTIVE SESSION: TO DISCUSS LEGAL, REAL ESTATE, AND PERSONNEL:

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to go into Executive Session to discuss Legal, Real Estate and Personnel. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

No action was taken out of Executive Session.

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to return to regular session. Council Member Abbey made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Pro-Tem Hall made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Avery made the second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM.

Date approved: _____

Mayor Gary Pirkle

ATTEST:

City Clerk