

**CITY OF BERKELEY LAKE  
4040 SOUTH BERKELEY LAKE ROAD  
BERKELEY LAKE, GEORGIA 30096  
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
FULL MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 8, 2026  
7:15 PM**

Those in attendance at the meeting were as follows:

Commission Members:                      Dan Huntington  
                                                         Pekka Ignatius  
                                                         George Kaffezakis  
                                                         Rand Kirkus  
                                                         Dave Meilander

City Officials:                                      Leigh Threadgill - City Administrator  
                                                         Michela Monteiro – Special Projects Coordinator

Citizens Present:                                      5

**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.

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

**III. MINUTES**

1. Minutes of June 9, 2026

**Meilander moved to approve the minutes of the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ignatius seconded the motion, and all voted to approve the minutes.**

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business to discuss.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

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

Huntington opened the public hearing. He noted that comments have been received from within the document, and the last comment period closed yesterday, and there is an opportunity to provide comments here tonight. This will be a comment period, but nothing will be settled here tonight. He noted the board will consider the comments over the next several weeks.

Gary Volino, 380 Lakeshore Drive, noted that he put a document together that he hoped everyone saw. It was prepared by assembling responses from people he hired to review the draft. He agrees with some of their comments, but not all of them. Overall, the theme was whether the proposed rules were analyzed from a cost impact. There is concern about the cost impact to development of his property. This is not a negative comment. The second comment is that in working with these guys, they also asked about other business owners and other properties. The particular concern was regarding the transparency requirements and impact in M-1. Warehouses don't typically have transparency. He noted that Ryerson doesn't know that this is happening, but they are hands off and not too concerned about the remnant tracts they have here.

Huntington asked Volino to clarify his comments regarding transparency.

Volino noted that he may be wrong, but it looks like a lot of buildings have to have a certain amount of glass, like 50%, and that adds cost. When you put in a warehouse, you won't have that much glass. This would adversely affect warehouse property. I don't know what else would be similar to that, this is an example.

Volino continued that he found it difficult to read. The consultants he had review the draft said that the Gwinnett County code is the Gwinnett County code and it is the basis of most of these ordinances. The folks going through it had trouble because of the nuances that are different from Gwinnett County, and it's not clear what is different from Gwinnett County rules. It would be best to point out what will be done differently here. For instance, rope lighting, string lighting and building materials aren't regulated in Gwinnett County code, that is mostly left to HOA's to regulate. If someone buys property, will the code be disclosed like HOA covenants would be? Can this be made into two different documents? One that is the Gwinnett County code and then all the rules that are normally found in a HOA document. 90% of it's great. But these are just suggestions.

Ignatius asked Volino what the realtors said about the disclosure requirement for the code. Volino responded that they said no it wouldn't be disclosed like HOA covenants would be.

Volino noted that he hired a civil engineer, developer, architect and zoning attorney to review this.

Huntington noted that any comments made tonight will be considered before we vote on how to recommend the UDO. He further outlined the options for how to move forward, and he sees

three options: recommend denial, recommend approval of the draft as is, or recommend approval of the draft with conditions. We anticipate that there will be the need for the UDO to be improved even after the UDO is adopted.

Volino asked about the last piece of property that was developed in Berkeley Lake. Threadgill responded it is the building under construction at the corner of North Berkeley Lake Road and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard. Volino asked if it would be able to be built the same way under the UDO. Threadgill said that she would have to look further into that to be able to answer that question. Volino noted that it has very few windows.

Volino asked if the goal of the UDO is to get the commercial property developed or just to update the current code. Threadgill responded that it is both. Volino responded that makes sense.

Huntington noted that there are older commercial properties that we hope will redevelop and the timing of this is pretty good so that we have the ordinances we want in place before the redevelopment occurs.

Kaffezakis asked about the time-frame moving forward. Threadgill noted that many comments were made today, and staff and the consultant still have to review the recent comments. Some of the new comments in the second comment period were backlash to changes to address comments from the first comment period. One take home from this is that there is no way to make everyone happy. There will be people who may feel that their concerns weren't addressed to their satisfaction. Ideally, this will be back to P&Z in October.

Kaffezakis noted in response to Volino's comment that if there is 90% agreement on the proposed UDO, that is a good endorsement.

Threadgill reviewed the recent history of UDO comments and revisions.

There were no further citizen comments.

Huntington closed the public hearing.

## **VI. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

There were none.

## **VII. DISCUSSION**

There was none.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**Kaffezakis made a motion to adjourn. Meilander seconded the motion. All were in favor and Huntington adjourned the meeting at 7:41 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leigh Threadgill  
City Administrator

