CITY OF BERKELEY LAKE
4040 SOUTH BERKELEY LAKE ROAD
BERKELEY LAKE, GEORGIA 30096
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FULL MINUTES
OCTOBER 13, 2026
7:15 PM

Those in attendance at the meeting were as follows:

Commission Members:	Dan Huntington Pekka Ignatius Rand Kirkus Dave Meilander
City Officials:	Leigh Threadgill - City Administrator Michela Monteiro – Special Projects Coordinator
Citizens Present:	3

I. CALL TO ORDER

Huntington called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM. A quorum of the commission along with City Administrator, Leigh Threadgill, and Special Projects Coordinator, Michela Monteiro, were present at the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF OR CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Huntington asked if there were any suggested changes to the agenda.

Kirkus moved to approve the agenda. Ignatius seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion passed.

III. MINUTES

1. Minutes of September 8, 2026

Ignatius moved to approve the minutes of the September 8th meeting. Kirkus seconded the motion, and all voted to approve the minutes.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

a) PZRZ-26-05 – O-26-263 - Ordinance to Adopt a Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map

Huntington opened the public hearing and asked for public comment.

There were no comments.

Huntington closed the public hearing.

Huntington opened the discussion among the commissioners.

Huntington stated that we are making a recommendation to City Council for or against this UDO. At this point we're considering version 3 with any other changes we want to recommend.

There was discussion around what was left to be decided after P&Z's work session meeting.

Ignatius mentioned that the prohibition of regulation of string lights was not entirely deleted, there was still regulation on page 158 of the UDO document. Huntington noted that the prohibition was struck on page 155 but remained on page 158. Threadgill confirmed and noted that deleting Section 7.4.2.G. should be included in the list of amendments in the motion to city council.

Ignatius noted that he could not find a limit on the number of chickens on page 110. Huntington noted that Section G.2.F sets the maximum at four. Threadgill noted that this did not change from the previous version.

Ignatius noted that he did not recall the commission agreeing on the requirement that garage doors be set back 10 feet from the front of the house, stating that he does not agree with that standard. Threadgill noted that her notes from the work session showed that, while the agreement was not unanimous, four members were in favor of keeping the rule but not applying it to existing residential uses. Other commissioners confirmed that was their understanding as well, to keep the standard but only apply it to new construction. Threadgill noted that if a member did not want to vote on a motion that included a change that did not address his concern, the recommendations may need to be split out individually. Ignatius noted that he would hold back on that and was willing to abide by the majority on the full list, as long as he was not opposed to too many items.

There was discussion about the revision to the tree ordinance to require permits for removal of 6" trees. Ignatius noted he doesn't agree with it, though the rest of the commission was in agreement to change the permit requirement to apply to 6" and larger trees, not 8" and larger trees as originally proposed.

Meilander asked about the prohibition on salvage or repair of motor vehicles in Section 6.A.2.F.3.a.vii on page 109, and whether it meant residents could not work on their own cars. Threadgill responded that the section covers home occupations and prohibits the activity as a business, such as running a body shop out of a home. She noted that the language is likely carried over from the existing home occupation rules. There was no further concern with regard to this regulation.

Meilander noted that the red line for parking of recreational vehicles on page 112 was difficult to follow, as paragraph A appeared to be struck. Threadgill noted that the RV section was altered significantly after a lot of discussion with the consultant, and that the track changes formatting made the numbering hard to follow. Paragraph 2.A. remains and limits the size of recreational vehicles on a residential lot.

Huntington noted that trailers were pulled out of the RV section to be treated differently. Threadgill noted that trailers are not required to be stored on a paved surface like an RV or boat and have no numeric setback, but they cannot be located in front of the front building plane of the house and must be in the side or rear yard. This applies to trailers up to 4 feet in height.

Meilander asked about boats. Threadgill noted that boats and personal watercraft are included in the definition of recreational vehicle.

Huntington noted that at the work session the commission had generally agreed on 256 square feet for boathouse enclosed areas, but there had been further discussion about how much of this should be transparent, and there hadn't been a conclusion on what that verbiage should be. There was further discussion about visibility to and from the lake and whether one solid wall should be allowed, or some level of transparency requirement for each wall of the enclosure.

Huntington noted that part of the commission's role is to clearly express the spirit of the rule, and that there will always be a way around it for someone who is determined.

Threadgill noted that enforcing these types of rules is difficult during plan review and even harder once a structure is built. Contractors do not typically provide the detailed elevations that would be needed, and there is a balance between complexity and administration.

Huntington proposed a 256-square-foot enclosed area limit, no wall over 16 feet, and three of the four walls 75% transparent. Meilander suggested adding a statement of the section's purpose, to preserve visibility to and from the lake.

Huntington suggested simply replacing the 100-square-foot figure with 256 square feet. Threadgill agreed this was more straightforward and noted that implementation of the new code will show what may need to be changed in the future, and anything already built would be grandfathered. Ignatius agreed that the commission should not get too detailed and have the 256 square foot rule with the intent to limit the opacity of the structure.

There was further discussion regarding the existing boathouse enclosure rule.

Meilander noted that most houses sit above the lake with boathouses at the water's edge. Huntington noted that the current rule reflects the personal preferences of some people about 20 years ago, and that 256 square feet is a compromise. Kirkus noted that boathouses around the lake vary and that it is hard to write one code that covers every possibility. The commission agreed to change the figure in Section 6.8.2.B.1.g. from 100 to 256 square feet with no additional restrictions.

Huntington confirmed that the other changes related to flagpoles, signs and trees had been made in accordance with feedback from the commission and asked if there was any disagreement or questions. There were none.

Meilander noted that the old code had a four-inch tree diameter when he started building his house. Huntington noted that the tree requirement has changed about three times during his time on Planning & Zoning, and finding the right balance has been difficult.

Threadgill noted that the tree code will have the biggest impact on the community. If the City is serious about being a Tree City and caring for the urban forest, the code must be strong enough to enforce. The city is losing mature canopy due to age and is spending more each year on tree removal and cleanup. Huntington noted that the commission should discuss at a later date whether the code does enough to incentivize planting new trees as mature trees are lost, possibly on a city-wide basis.

Ignatius moved to recommend approval of Version 3.0 of the Unified Development Ordinance with the following amendments: delete Section 7.4.2.G., and change Section 6.8.2.B.1.g. from 100 square feet to 256 square feet. Meilander seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion passed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

VI. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were none.

VII. DISCUSSION

There was none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meilander made a motion to adjourn. Ignatius seconded the motion. All were in favor and Huntington adjourned the meeting at 7:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Leigh Threadgill
City Administrator