



CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, September 02, 2025, at 6:00 PM
Council Chambers and YouTube Livestream

Website: www.forestparkga.gov
YouTube: <https://bit.ly/3c28p0A>
Phone Number: (404) 366.4720

FOREST PARK CITY HALL
745 Forest Parkway
Forest Park, GA 30297

The Honorable Mayor Angelyne Butler, MPA
The Honorable Kimberly James
The Honorable Hector Gutierrez
The Honorable Delores A. Gunn
The Honorable Latresa Akins-Wells
The Honorable Allan Mears
Latosha Clemons, Interim City Manager
Randi Rainey, City Clerk
Danielle Matricardi, City Attorney

APPROVED MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME: Mayor Butler called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL - CITY CLERK: A quorum was established.

Attendee's Name	Title	Absent	Present
Angelyne Butler, MPA	Mayor, At-Large		X
Kimberly James	Council Member, Ward 1		X
Councilmember Gunn	Council Member, Ward 2		X
Hector Gutierrez	Council Member, Ward 3		X
Latresa Akins-Wells	Council Member, Ward 4		X
Allan Mears	Council Member, Ward 5	X	

Pauline Warrior, Chief of Staff; Josh Cox, IT Director; Rodney Virgil, Level 2 Support Engineer; Kwame Marshall Multimedia Specialist; John Wiggins, Finance Director; Shalonda Brown, HR Director; Beverly Moultrie, Risk Management; Nicole Dozier, PCD Director; Rochelle Dennis, Economic Development Director; Dorthy Roper-Jackson, Municipal Court Director; Tarik Maxwell, Director of Rec and Leisure; Alton Matthews, Public Works Director; Nigel Whatley, Deputy Public Works Director; Latosha Clemons, Fire Chief; David Halcome, Deputy Fire Derry Walker, Code Compliance Director; Ricky Clark, City Manager, and Danielle Matricardi, City Attorney.

ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH ANY ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:

It was moved to approve the consent agenda as printed.

The motion was made by Councilmember James and seconded by Councilmember Gunn.

Voting Yea: Councilmember James, Councilmember Gunn, Councilmember Gutierrez, Councilmember Akins-Wells.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA WITH ANY ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:

It was moved to approve the agenda as printed.

The motion was made by Councilmember Gunn and seconded by Councilmember James.

Voting Yea: Councilmember James, Councilmember Gunn, Councilmember Gutierrez, Councilmember Akins-Wells.

CONSENT AGENDA: (There was no discussion.)

1. **Council Discussion and Approval of Blanket Purchase Order for Tactical Gear Supply – The City of Forest Park Police Department- Police Department**

Background/History:

The City of Forest Park Police Department respectfully requests approval to create a Blanket Purchase Order (BPO) with **Tactical Gear Supply** for Fiscal Year 2025/2026 to cover the purchase of police officer uniforms and related equipment. This includes, but is not limited to, dress pants and shirts, BDU pants, polos, badges, patches, belts, hats, and other essential gear.

Approval of this BPO will ensure that the department can maintain consistent uniform standards and provide officers with the necessary equipment to perform their duties effectively and professionally.

The total requested amount is **\$58,000.00**, to be allocated from **Fund 100-31-3210-53-1702**

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Council Discussion on the Proposed Amendment to the Charter to Amend Section 2.15 (Inquiries and Investigations) of Article II (Governmental Structure)-Executive Office**

Background/History:

In accordance with O.C.G.A. § 36-35-3, the Mayor and Council of the City of Forest Park are authorized to amend the City Charter. The proposed amendment seeks to revise Section 2.15, "Inquiries and Investigations," of Article II, "Governmental Structure."

At the recent strategic planning retreat, there was a general consensus to amend the Charter by revising the governing body's investigation process. With the adoption of this revision, investigations are still possible, but they would require approval of the Governing Body.

Comments/Discussion from Governing Body:

Councilmember Akins-Wells asked Attorney Matricardi for clarification, noting that some individuals do not like it when councilmembers or elected officials speak with employees. She stated that she would continue to do this regardless of the charter. She recalled that Mr. Clark and the former City Manager discouraged such communication and asked whether the proposal would prevent employees from coming to a councilmember or the mayor if they felt an issue was not being addressed. Attorney Matricardi clarified that nothing in the proposal would prevent an employee from going directly to a councilmember. However, she recommended that employees still follow the formal process.

Attorney Matricardi clarified that the proposal would not prohibit employees from going directly to a councilmember. She explained that the intent is to resolve the conflict in the charter between the section prohibiting councilmembers from giving directives to city employees and the section allowing individual councilmembers to question employees directly. She emphasized that employees could still bring concerns to the council, but it would limit the reverse situation in which a councilmember independently sought to investigate a matter.

Councilmember Akins-Wells asked for clarification, stating that, within the city, it appeared no elected officials would be able to investigate anything. Attorney Matricardi confirmed that was correct, noting an investigation would need to be a joint effort by the full governing body.

Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she wanted clarification on what “investigate” meant. She explained that, in her view, simply asking an employee how things were going could start a conversation, and she wanted to understand the limits. She expressed concern that employee issues are often said to be “under investigation,” but nothing is done, so employees turn to individuals they trust. She emphasized that she wanted to understand the intent of the provision fully. Attorney Matricardi explained that “investigating” referred to probing or asking city employees questions about their day-to-day work or the operations and administration of the city. She clarified that this provision would not prohibit employees from speaking to elected officials.

3. **Council Discussion for the selection of a professional recruitment firm to complete a nationwide search for the selection of a new City Manager – Executive Office**

Background/History:

Due to the recent vacancy of the city’s current City Manager, the Governing Body is seeking to contract with a professional recruitment firm to complete a nationwide search for a new City Manager for the City of Forest Park. The Procurement Division has completed the attached reference of firms’ comparison report for the Governing Body’s consideration.

Mrs. Adams, Procurement Manager, reported on the recruitment firm proposals, noting that outreach was made to several firms and that only two proposals were submitted. She outlined the key differences: the first firm, based in Alpharetta, proposed a cost of \$21,000 plus additional expenses and offered a one-year guarantee, while the second firm, based in Norcross, suggested \$24,521 inclusive of most costs and offered a two-year warranty. Mrs. Adams concluded by asking for clarification from the governing body, stating her understanding was that the intent was only to gather information and issue an RFP, not to direct staff to bring firms forward for consideration.

Comments/Discussion from Governing Body:

Mayor Butler asked the governing body for clarification, stating that she understood the intent was to gather information and issue an RFP, not to direct staff to identify and bring firms forward for consideration.

Councilmember James stated that she thought the intent was to find a firm to perform the work, not simply to gather information.

Attorney Matricardi noted that the governing body needed to discuss whether to proceed with a formal or informal RFP and determine the outcome of the discussion. She stated that her understanding was that the majority consensus had been to proceed in that manner, but if she had heard incorrectly, then she stood corrected. She added that the firms identified were within the local area and that she had provided a list to Procurement to reach out to.

Councilmember Gunn asked for an explanation of the difference between Formal and Informal. Attorney Matricardi explained the difference between the formal and informal processes. She stated that a formal process would require a sealed Request for Proposals (RFP), advertised for at least a month, after which submissions would be presented to the Mayor and Council at a subsequent meeting. She noted that the informal process, by contrast, involves directly requesting proposals from selected companies and is faster. She emphasized that the process could be conducted either way, depending on the governing body's preference. Mrs. Adams noted that most of the city's formal solicitations are used when the value of the contract exceeds \$50,000.

Interim City Manager Chief Clemons stated that Procurement had correctly issued the solicitation for bid and explained that this is standard practice to ensure transparency. She noted that many municipalities use this process when recruiting for city manager, fire chief, and deputy chief positions.

Councilmember Gunn asked whether the bids presented to the governing body resulted from a formal process. Mrs. Adams clarified that the method used was informal, noting that informal solicitations are less costly and involve staff directly contacting vendors in the industry to request quotes. She explained that formal solicitations are required for contracts expected to exceed the \$50,000 threshold, which is the governing body's approval limit, and those are issued as Requests for Proposals or similar solicitations. She added that recruitment services are specialized, with a limited number of firms providing them, and therefore, she reached out to five or six firms recommended by Attorney Matricardi. Of those firms, two submitted proposals were included in the packets for review, and two others declined to submit at this time.

Councilmember James felt the city needed to move forward with selecting one of the two firms. She recommended the Norcross firm based on its two-year guarantee and 27 years of experience. She advised that delaying the decision would prolong the process and emphasized that candidates could still apply for the position once the criteria were established. She concluded that the choice ultimately rested with the governing body.

Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she believed pursuing a formal process would be better, as it is more transparent. She explained that, while it was not a matter of personal trust, she preferred an open bid process over being presented with paperwork from two firms. She added that her understanding was that this was the approach previously discussed and emphasized that a formal bid process would ensure greater transparency. Mrs. Adams noted that the minimum time for a formal Request for Proposals is 90 to 120 days, which requires forming an evaluation committee and

advertising for at least 30 days. She explained that the process is lengthier, taking about three months before a firm could be engaged to assist with the recruitment process. Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she understood the longer timeline for a formal process, but emphasized that the city manager role is vital and should not be rushed. She said that if the process takes 90 days, then that is the time it should take, and she expressed disagreement with moving forward quickly simply because it is faster. She noted that the city has experienced challenges with previous city managers and stressed that it would be better to go through the whole process rather than risk repeating past mistakes.

Mayor Butler stated that she did not recall the process taking as long as suggested and urged the governing body to change direction by issuing a 30-day RFP while simultaneously preparing the selection process through a committee.

Councilmember Gutierrez asked whether there were many recruitment firms available, noting that, unlike contractors, where there are numerous options, he questioned if issuing an RFP would yield results much different from the proposals already received. Mrs. Adams responded that the city would likely receive proposals from the same companies she had already contacted, as those firms located locally within Georgia perform this type of work. Attorney Matricardi added that issuing a formal RFP could bring responses from out-of-state firms. However, the local companies she had already contacted would still be the primary respondents. Mrs. Adams noted that out-of-state firms could result in higher costs, as the city would be responsible for expenses such as airfare, lodging, and other travel-related costs if those firms were selected to meet with the governing body.

Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she was comfortable with the possibility of higher costs for this position, noting that it is not just any role. She added that if a more expensive firm proved to be stronger than the two options presented, it could be worth the investment. She remarked that “you get what you pay for” and concluded that the decision ultimately rested with the governing body. Chief Clemons stated that, based on her review of the bids included in the agenda packet, the process would typically take about 60 days. She added that the final decision rested with the governing body.

Councilmember Gunn asked for clarification, stating that if the city waited 60 days, it would receive proposals from the same firms through procurement to contract with the city for the recruitment process. Mrs. Adams explained that if the governing body proceeded with a formal RFP, the process would take at least 90 days. She outlined that the first 30 days are for advertisement, followed by proposal review and scoring by the evaluation committee, which can take an additional one to two weeks depending on the number of proposals and the committee’s availability. She noted that the committee generally holds at least three meetings before recommending the highest-scoring proposal to Council. She further explained that the two firms already under consideration estimated their recruitment processes to take 60 to 90 days once engaged, including developing the city manager’s profile and soliciting candidates.

Councilmember James stated that she felt the discussion had become more focused on selecting a recruitment firm rather than on ensuring the qualifications of the next city manager. She noted that the list of candidates applying would likely not change regardless of the firm, but expressed concern about history repeating itself, recalling a prior process where the selection of a firm was sidetracked and resulted in the approval of a less qualified city manager. She urged the governing body to remain focused on the qualifications and capabilities of the future city manager rather than solely on the firm conducting the recruitment.

Councilmember Gunn stated that the city needs stable leadership to ensure alignment and order with an interim manager serving in a dual role. Speaking on behalf of Ward 2, she emphasized that whether the process takes 60, 90, or 120 days, the city must still go through the same steps, including developing a profile, reviewing resumes, and conducting interviews. She stressed the importance of moving forward rather than remaining stagnant, comparing the need to cover the city manager position to keeping a household in order. She expressed excitement about the city's future and the importance of having a permanent city manager in place to lead department heads and ensure proper operations. She concluded that, for Ward 2, she supported moving forward, selecting the best candidate, and filling the position without delay.

Councilmember Gutierrez asked for clarification on the item before the body, noting that Mrs. Adams had sent information to two firms and questioning whether the governing body was being asked to choose between only those two out of the five or six firms identified. Mrs. Adams stated that her role was to provide a report of her findings after being asked to contact recruitment firms. She explained that she gathered information on how long the firms had been in business and what other municipalities they had served. She noted that the City of Stockbridge had provided positive feedback regarding the second firm listed. She further reported that two firms declined to submit proposals without giving specific reasons, and another firm never responded.

Mr. Clark clarified that the governing body's selection of a firm would allow the council to determine the specific requirements for the recruitment process. He explained that the firm works on behalf of the governing body and must follow its direction, whether forwarding all applications, narrowing to a set number of top candidates, or conducting community meetings. He emphasized that every application received would belong to the governing body. He noted that local firms have advantages due to their established talent pools and relationships with regional city managers. Mr. Clark added that although "informal" may sound misleading, it is a legal term for the solicitation method and still represents a structured process.

Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she understood the difference between the formal and informal processes and emphasized that the governing body creates the process. Speaking on behalf of Ward 4, she recalled that Councilmember Gunn had previously expressed concern about the process being removed from the governing body. She stressed the importance of transparency and ensuring that the council fulfills its role rather than delegating decision-making entirely to an outside firm. She added that while the governing body may ultimately choose to work with a recruitment firm, she did not want to be handed limited options and asked to decide without full involvement. She concluded that the final decision rests with the governing body but reiterated that Ward 4 supports transparency and the council maintaining control of the process.

Councilmember Gunn stated that she appreciated receiving the recruitment package, noting it provided the information she had asked for and helped her better understand the process. She expressed that she was pleased with one of the bids submitted. She emphasized that councilmembers would have access to all applicants and the ability to review and decide collectively as a body. She thanked the staff for putting the package together and calling it thorough and informative. She added that her request had been to engage a firm to handle the legwork, as she does not handle HR, and she expressed excitement about the process moving forward. She concluded that she wanted someone in the city manager's seat with the holidays approaching.

Chief Clemons concluded by stating that the recruitment firm serves as the talent scout, and once candidates are identified, it is up to the governing body, in collaboration with Human Resources, to vet and approve the next city manager.

Councilmember Gutierrez asked whether the one-year guarantee offered by one of the firms for the city manager position was a common practice among recruitment firms or unique to the firm listed as number one. Mrs. Adams responded that the one-year guarantee was a highlight of the first firm's proposal, while the second firm offered an even longer guarantee of two years. Attorney Matricardi added that the guarantee was a new feature being offered by the firms. She stated that she had not previously heard of recruiting firms providing such guarantees in local government.

4. **Council Discussion on the Recommended Proposed Millage Rate-** Finance Department

Background/History:

The City of Forest Park has tentatively adopted a 2025 millage rate requiring increased property taxes by 1.21 percent due to rising property values. Although the City proposes to keep the millage rate at 16.74 mills, the increase in property values results in a property tax increase.

All concerned citizens are invited to the public hearing on the tax increase at the Forest Park City Hall on September 2, 2025, at 7:00 p.m.

Times and places of additional public hearings on this tax increase are at Forest Park City Hall at 745 Forest Parkway on September 15, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. and again at 7:00 p.m.

This tentative increase will result in a millage rate of 16.74 mills, an increase of 1.21 percent. Without this tentative increase, the millage rate will be no more than 2.0 mills. The proposed tax increase for a home with a fair market value of \$100,000 is approximately \$8.00 (**Public Hearing to Follow in the Regular Session Meeting**).

Director Wiggins explained that the millage rate is established annually by the City Council, noted the required public notices and tax digest snapshots published in the legal organ, and stated that Finance was recommending the rate remain the same for 2025.

5. **Council Discussion to Approve Case # RZ-2025-02 Rezoning Request for 486 Main Street (Zoned RM – Multiple Family Residential) and 0 Burks Rd (Zoned RT – Two Family Residential) from RM and RT to GC (General Commercial District) to allow the development of a unified parking area supporting future business operations-** PCD Department

Background/History:

The subject property consists of three vacant parcels totaling approximately 1.23+/- acres in Ward 2. The primary parcel is located at 486 Main Street, occupying the southwest corner of Main Street and Burks Road. The two additional vacant parcels are situated immediately behind the proposed parcel, west of the existing commercial structure, occupying the northwest portion of the block formed by Burks Road and North Avenue. The applicant requests a rezoning of all three parcels from residential to commercial to support the development of a unified off-street parking area in preparation for relocating future commercial operations to the site. Currently, the corner parcel fronting Main Street is zoned Multiple-Family Residential District (RM) and is adjacent to existing multifamily residential development to the west. The two interior parcels along Burks Road are zoned Two-Family Residential District (RT), surrounded by a mix of townhomes and single-family residences.

Director Dozier stated that the applicant was requesting a rezoning of the parcels to expand parking at the site. She noted that the Planning Commission considered the item on Thursday, August 21, and recommended approval with conditions. The conditions included limiting rezoning, site plan review, buffering, use restrictions, and truck parking restrictions, intended to control commercial development and prevent encroachment on residential areas along North Avenue. Director Dozier concluded by respectfully recommending approval of the rezoning with the stated conditions.

Comments/Discussion from Governing Body:

Councilmember James asked for clarification regarding the rezoning conditions. She confirmed that the property would be rezoned from RM (Residential Multi-Family) and RT (Residential Townhouse) to GC (General Commercial), which would allow for a range of business types. She asked whether the conditions would limit the types of businesses permitted or vehicles allowed. Director Dozier explained that the petition involved a commercial structure on the site, with part of the property already zoned commercial and the adjacent parcels zoned residential. She stated that the applicant requested to rezone the residential parcels along Burke Street to General Commercial to expand. However, staff recommended that only one of the parcels be rezoned to commercial, with the remaining parcels staying residential.

Councilmember James asked which parcels will remain the same. Director Dozier clarified that, based on the site plan included in the documentation, the two parcels along Burks Road marked “rezoning to commercial for parking” would remain residential. She explained that only the rear parcel at the bottom along Burks Road would be rezoned to General Commercial to allow the business to expand to that area.

Ms. Hernandez, the property owner, agreed with the recommendation to rezone only the bottom parcel to General Commercial. However, she expressed concern about the truck parking restriction, explaining that her wholesale distribution business requires space to park trucks. She requested permission to park approximately five trucks in the area, three for storage and two for deliveries. She expressed willingness to work with the city and nearby residents to address the concern.

Councilmember James expressed concern about the rezoning because of the recent construction of new townhomes in the area. She acknowledged that the site was unsightly but expressed concern that changing the zoning to General Commercial could open the door for additional commercial development, even with the proposed restrictions. Ms. Hernandez, the property owner, stated that there were no plans to build on the rear parcel and that the intent was only to pave it for additional parking, as parking in the front of the building is limited. She explained that clients often visit in work vans and need full access to a clear parking area. She described the business as a wholesale distribution company selling Mexican candy, drinks, and other groceries to Hispanic stores throughout Georgia.

Councilmember Akins-Wells stated that she trusted the staff’s recommendation and expressed support for the rezoning request. She noted that she is pro-business and emphasized the importance of attracting businesses to the City of Forest Park by making the process easier, not harder. She concluded by voicing her agreement and thanking the staff.

Councilmember James asked the property owner if the no-truck-parking restriction recommended by the board would create an issue for their business operations. Ms. Hernandez confirmed that the no-truck-parking restriction would be an issue for her business, explaining that she operates five trucks that

must be parked for storage or use in deliveries. She requested space or permission to park them on site.

Councilmember Akins-Wells asked Director Dozier if the rezoning could be approved with staff's recommendations, but with the truck parking restriction modified to allow a limited number of trucks rather than prohibiting truck parking entirely. Director Dozier stated that the board could modify the truck parking restriction if it chose to do so. She then read the current restriction for clarity, noting that it was intended to preserve the residential character of the rear parcels. The restriction states that truck parking is prohibited on all portions of the property, including the rear parcel zoned RT, though trucks may access the site for loading and unloading purposes.

Ms. Hernandez, the property owner, stated that while she understood the restriction allowing for loading and unloading, her concern was where the business could park its trucks at night. She explained that the intent was not to use the rear parcels for truck parking but to modify the front area to create designated spaces for them.

Councilmember Akins-Wells suggested modifying the restriction to ensure the property is not used for permanent truck parking. She proposed adding a stipulation, such as limiting truck parking to no longer than 24 or 48 hours, to allow for necessary loading and unloading while addressing concerns about overnight or long-term parking. Ms. Hernandez, the property owner, clarified that her business primarily uses box trucks, not tractor-trailers. She explained that tractor trailers only come to the site for unloading, while the box trucks are the ones regularly parked for business operations. Director Dozier clarified that staff recommended against parking on the site because the proposed parking area was located on parcels closer to the residential properties. She explained that this was the reason staff recommended that parking not be permitted in that portion of the site.

Councilmember Gunn asked Director Dozier if the primary concern with granting the rezoning was that it would create an eyesore for the nearby residential properties or if the issue was increased traffic. She clarified whether the concern centered on the impact on the homeowners who had recently purchased property in the area. Director Dozier responded that the problems mentioned were why staff recommended restricting truck access along Burks Road toward North Avenue, noting that this area is where the surrounding residential properties are.

Attorney Matricardi stated that she attended the Planning Commission meeting, where the restriction on truck parking for the front parcel was recommended to avoid creating an eyesore on Main Street. She added that, as Councilmember Wells suggested, the restriction could be modified to limit overnight parking to 48 hours or require trucks to be parked farther away from Main Street.

Councilmember Gunn asked if there was a way to revisit the restriction discussed by the Planning Commission to determine whether alternative areas could be identified that would not negatively impact the nearby residential properties. She stated that the goal would be to make the arrangement more conducive for the business to continue operating while balancing the community's concerns. Director Dozier noted that, based on Attorney Matricardi's recommendation, the restriction could be modified to limit the hours of truck parking and cap the number of trucks at five, as suggested by Councilmember James. She added that staff would work with the applicant to determine parking locations on the parcel facing Main Street, possibly moving them back, but not too close to the residential area. She noted that landscaping and buffering could also be considered, and that these adjustments were options for the council to include in its recommendation.

Councilmember James asked for clarification on the proposed buffer and requested details on what the buffer would include. Director Dozier explained that buffers are typically landscaped and range from five to fifteen feet in width. She noted that staff had not evaluated this site with additional landscaping in mind but would review the location to determine how buffering could be incorporated if parking were relocated. She clarified that the purpose of the buffer is to separate and mitigate the impact of commercial use on adjacent residential properties and confirmed that landscaping is already required by code.

6. **Council Discussion to Approve Case # CUP-2025-04- Conditional Use Permit for 5000 Governors Dr to establish and operate an Assisted living facility within the Single-Family Residential District (RS) in Ward 2- PCD Department**

Background/History:

The applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit to establish and operate an Assisted Living facility within the Single-Family Residential District (RS) in Ward 2. Per Sec 8-8-28 - Single-family residential district (RS), Assisted living/nursing home, and residential care facility for children and adults require a conditional use permit to operate within the Single-Family Residential District. On August 21, 2025, the Planning Commission approved the Conditional Use Permit.

The proposed location is currently developed as a licensed memory care and assisted living facility known as Governor's Glen. It operates under a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a long-term residential care facility within the RS zoning classification. The applicant is now requesting approval of a new CUP to reflect a change in ownership and business name. The new permit would formally recognize the new ownership entity while maintaining compliance with the City's land use requirements. No changes are proposed to the existing land use, building footprint, operations, or intensity of use. The facility will continue to serve as an assisted living residence for seniors requiring cognitive and physical care.

Director Dozier explained that the request involved changing the ownership and name of the existing facility. She stated that this was part of the process to ensure the conditional use reflected the new business and owner, and she respectfully requested approval of the item.

7. **Council Discussion to Approve Massage Establishments as a business license type within the City of Forest Park- PCD Department**

Background/History:

As part of the City's business licensing process, staff recently received an application for a proposed massage therapy business seeking to operate within the City of Forest Park.

Per Sec. 9-7-4. - Licensing of massage business operators and masseurs:

- (a) No person, partnership, corporation or association shall operate a massage business as herein defined, or engage in the business or profession of massage, unless such person, partnership, corporation or association shall have first applied for and received the license provided by this chapter.
- (b) Every application for the license prescribed herein shall be upon a form approved by the city manager and shall be filed with the city manager or his designated representative.

Upon review of this ordinance, it has been determined that applicants for a Massage Establishment license are required to appear before Mayor and Council for consideration and approval of the license

type. The application has been reviewed by Planning, Fire, Police, and Building departments, and no comments or objections have been noted at this time.

Should Mayor and Council approve the request, the applicant may proceed with establishing and operating the massage therapy business within the City.

Director Dozier stated that this was the first time the city had processed an application for a massage therapy establishment. She explained that the code requires such applications to be explicitly submitted to the Mayor and Council for approval. She noted that the proposed location was 1105 Forest Parkway, that the application had been reviewed, and respectfully requested approval of the establishment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (When an Executive Session is required, one will be called for the following issues: Personnel, Litigation, or Real Estate.)

It was moved to recess into Executive Session at 6:54 p.m. for Personnel, Litigation, or Real Estate.

The motion was made by Councilmember Akins-Wells and seconded by Councilmember Gunn.

Voting Yea: Councilmember James, Councilmember Gunn, Councilmember Gutierrez, Councilmember Akins-Wells.

It was moved to reconvene the Work Session Meeting at 7:10 p.m.

The motion was made by Councilmember James and seconded by Councilmember Gunn.

Voting Yea: Councilmember James, Councilmember Gunn, Councilmember Gutierrez, Councilmember Akins-Wells.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Butler adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those requiring meeting accommodation should notify the City Clerk's Office at 404-366-4720 at least 24 hours before the meeting.

City Clerk's Signature

Mayor's Signature