STATE OF GEORGIA
HENRY COUNTY
CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE

RESOLUTION NO. R20-1204

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE, GEORGIA ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN BUSINESSES IN THE CITY; TO REPEAL CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS; TO PROVIDE FOR SEVERABILITY; TO PROVIDE FOR AN ADOPTION DATE AND EFFECTIVE DATE; TO PROVIDE A PENALTY; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

WHEREAS, the City of Stockbridge has been vested with substantial powers, rights and functions to generally regulate the practice, conduct or use of property for the purposes of maintaining health, morals, safety, security, peace, and the general welfare of the City of Stockbridge; and

WHEREAS, Georgia law recognizes that local governments may impose moratoria on zoning decisions, building permits, and other development approvals where exigent circumstances warrant the same, pursuant to case law found at *City of Roswell et al v. Outdoor Systems, Inc.*, 274 Ga. 130, 549 S.E.2d 90 (2001); *Lawson v. Macon*, 214 Ga. 278, 104 S.E.2d 425 (1958); *Taylor v. Shetzen*, 212 Ga. 101, 90 S.E.2d 572 (1955); and

WHEREAS, the Courts take judicial notice of a local government's inherent ability to impose moratoria on an emergency basis; and

WHEREAS, the Georgia Supreme Court, in the case of *DeKalb County v. Townsend*, 243 Ga. 80 (1979), held that, "To justify a moratorium, it must appear first, that the interests of the

public generally, as distinguished from those of a particular class, require such interference; and second, that the means are reasonably necessary for the accomplishment of the purpose, and not unduly oppressive upon individuals." The City of Stockbridge has found that the interests of the public necessitate the enactment of a moratorium for health, safety, morals and general welfare purposes by means which are reasonable and not unduly oppressive; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the City of Stockbridge have, as a part of planning, zoning and growth management, been in review of the City's Zoning Ordinances and have been studying the City's best estimates and projections of the type of development which could be anticipated within the City of Stockbridge; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council deem it important to develop a comprehensive plan which integrates all of these concerns and therefore considers this moratorium a proper exercise of its police powers; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council therefore consider it paramount that land use regulation continue in the most orderly and predictable fashion with the least amount of disturbance to landowners and to the citizens of the City of Stockbridge. The Mayor and Council have always had a strong interest in growth management so as to promote the traditional police power goals of health, safety, morals, aesthetics and the general welfare of the community; and in particular the lessening of congestion on City streets, security of the public from crime and other dangers, promotion of health and general welfare of its citizens, protection of the aesthetic qualities of the City including access to air and light, and facilitation of the adequate provision of transportation and other public requirements; and

WHEREAS, it is the belief of the Mayor and Council of the City of Stockbridge that the concept of "public welfare" is broad and inclusive; that the values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary; and that it is within the power of the City "to determine that a community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patrolled," *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98 (1954); *Kelo v. City of New London*, 545 U.S. 469, 125 S. Ct. 2655, 162 L. Ed. 2d 439 (2005). It is also the opinion of the City that "general welfare" includes the valid public objectives of aesthetics, conservation of the value of existing lands and buildings within the City, making the most appropriate use of resources, preserving neighborhood characteristics, enhancing and protecting the economic well-being of the community, facilitating adequate provision of public services, and the preservation of the resources of the City; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council are, and have been interested in, developing a cohesive and coherent policy regarding certain uses in the City, and have intended to promote community development through stability, predictability and balanced growth which will further the prosperity of the City as a whole; and

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved by the Mayor and Council of the City of Stockbridge and by the authority of the same:

SECTION I.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Mayor and Council of the City of Stockbridge hereby make the following findings of fact:

(a) It appears that the City's development ordinances, Zoning Ordinance and/or Comprehensive Land Use Plan require an additional review by the City of Stockbridge as they relate to certain businesses;

(b) Substantial disorder, detriment and irreparable harm would result to the citizens, businesses and City of Stockbridge if the current land use regulation scheme in and for the above described use in the City were to be utilized by property owners prior to a more thorough review;

(c) The City's ongoing revision of its code, comprehensive plan and zoning ordinances requires that a limited cessation of development and building permits, occupation tax permits, and other licenses, permits or variances, with respect to the above described use, be enacted;

(d) It is necessary and in the public interest to delay, for a reasonable period of time, the processing of any applications for such developments, to ensure that the design, development and location of the same are consistent with the long-term planning objectives of the City; and

(e) That the Georgia Supreme Court has ruled that limited moratoria are reasonable and do not constitute land use when such moratoria are applied throughout the City under *City of Roswell et al v. Outdoor Systems Inc.*, 274 Ga. 130, 549 S.E.2d 90 (2001)

SECTION II.

IMPOSITION OF MORATORIUM

(1) There is hereby established a moratorium on the establishment of the following types of businesses and the acceptance by the staff of the City of Stockbridge of applications for any of the following types of businesses:

- Hookah bars and/or lounges
- Cigar bars and/or lounges

(2) The duration of this extended moratorium shall be until the City adopts a revision of the City Code of the City of Stockbridge related to the above referenced uses or until 120 days has elapsed, whichever first occurs;

(3) This moratorium shall be effective as of the date of adoption of this Resolution;

(4) This moratorium shall have no effect upon approvals or permits previously issued or as to development plans previously approved by the City. The provisions of this Resolution shall not affect the issuance of permits or site plan reviews that have received preliminary or final approval by the City or for which consultations have been had with the City staff on or before the effective date of this Resolution;

(5) As of the effective date of this Resolution, no applications for development or permits for the above described uses will be accepted by any agent, employee or officer of the City with respect to any property in the City of Stockbridge, and any permit so accepted for filing will be deemed in error, null and void and of no effect whatsoever and shall constitute no assurance whatsoever of any right to engage in any act, and any action in reliance on any such permit shall be unreasonable;

(6) The following procedures shall be put in place immediately. Under *Cannon v. Clayton County,* 255 Ga. 63, 335 S.E.2d 294 (1985); *Meeks v. City of Buford*, 275 Ga. 585, 571 S.E.2d 369 (2002); *City of Duluth v. Riverbroke Props.*, 233 Ga. App. 46, 502 S.E.2d 806 (1998), the Supreme Court stated, "Where a landowner makes a substantial change in position by expenditures and reliance on the probability of the issuance of a building permit, based upon an existing zoning ordinance and the assurances of zoning officials, he acquires vested rights and is entitled to have the permit issued despite a change in the zoning ordinance which would otherwise preclude the issuance of a permit." Pursuant to this case, the City of Stockbridge recognizes that, unknown to the City, de facto vesting may have occurred. The following procedures are established to provide exemptions from the moratorium where vesting has occurred:

A written application, including verified supporting data, documents and facts, may be made requesting a review by the Mayor and Council at a scheduled meeting of any facts or circumstances which the applicant feels substantiates a claim for vesting and the grant of an exemption.

SECTION III.

EXEMPTION

(1) During the term of this moratorium, any person may file an application for exemption from this moratorium with the Mayor and Council. The Mayor and Council may grant such exemption where the proposed establishment(s) is/are deemed to be in conformity with the proposed development ordinances, proposed Zoning Ordinance and/or the proposed Comprehensive Land Use Plan that are to be considered during the term of this moratorium. The Mayor and Council shall consider the general terms of the proposed development, the proposed

use, the proposed development plans, the benefits of the proposed development to the City, and the comprehensive land use plan for the City in deciding upon a requested exemption.

(2) Should the Mayor and Council grant such exemption, the staff of the City of Stockbridge may an application for the proposed use. However, the grant of an exemption from this moratorium in no way confers any rights upon the applicant or the exempted plans, applications or requests.

(3) Any exemption granted by the Mayor and Council shall not constitute final approval of such plans or requests by the City. Any granted exemption shall merely grant the City staff the ability to accept and process the subject application in accordance with all City laws.

SECTION IV.

(a) It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that all sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses and phrases of this Ordinance are and were, upon their enactment, believed by the Mayor and Council to be fully valid, enforceable and constitutional.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, each and every section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Chapter is severable from every other section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution. It is hereby further declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, no section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution is mutually dependent upon any other section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution.

(c) In the event that any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Resolution shall, for any reason whatsoever, be declared invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise

unenforceable by the valid judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, it is the express intent of the Mayor and Council that such invalidity, unconstitutionality or unenforceability shall, to the greatest extent allowed by law, not render invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable any of the remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or sections of the Resolution and that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, all remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections of the Resolution shall remain valid, constitutional, enforceable, and of full force and effect.

SECTION V.

All Resolutions or parts of Resolutions in conflict with this Resolution are, to the extent of such conflict, hereby repealed.

SECTION VI.

The preamble of this Resolution shall be considered to be and is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set out herein.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

RESOLVED this 25th day of August, 2020.

CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE, GEORGIA

Anthony S. Ford, Mayor

ATTEST:

Vanessa Holiday, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Michael Williams, City Attorney