

| APPLICANT: Brooks Chadwick, LLC | PETITION NO: | Z-27 |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| (404) 281-4554 | HEARING DATE (PC): | 05-06-14 |
| REPRESENTATIVE: John H. Moore (770) 429-1499 | HEARING DATE (BOC): | 05-20-14 |
| Moore Ingram Johnson & Steele, LLP | PRESENT ZONING: | RR |
| TITLEHOLDER: Tennis Academy of Georgia, Inc. | | |
| | PROPOSED ZONING: | RM-8 |
| PROPERTY LOCATION: Southeast side of Audubon Drive, | | |
| south of Fairfield Drive. | PROPOSED USE: Single | e-Family Attached |
| (900 Audubon Drive) | R | esidential Units |
| ACCESS TO PROPERTY: Audubon Drive | SIZE OF TRACT: | 2.802 acres |
| | DISTRICT: | 16 |
| PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS TO SITE: Existing tennis | LAND LOT(S): | 976 |
| facility | PARCEL(S): | 7 |
| | TAXES: PAID X | DUE |
| | COMMISSION DISTRIC | T: 2 |

CONTIGUOUS ZONING/DEVELOPMENT

| NORTH: | R-20/ Indian Hills |
|--------|---|
| SOUTH: | RM-8/ Pinecrest Townhomes, Fawn Ridge Townhomes |
| EAST: | RM-8/ Pinecrest (unit 1) |
| WEST: | RM-8/ Fawn Ridge at Indian Hills (unit 1) |

OPPOSITION: NO. OPPOSED ____PETITION NO: ____SPOKESMAN _____

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

APPROVED____MOTION BY_____

REJECTED____SECONDED____


HELD____CARRIED____

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS DECISION


APPROVED_____MOTION BY_____ REJECTED____SECONDED_____

HELD____CARRIED____

STIPULATIONS:



Z-27



| APPLICANT: Brooks Cha | dwick, LLC | PETITION NO.: Z-27 | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| PRESENT ZONING: | RR | PETITION FO | R: RM-8 | | | |
| * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | * * * * * * * * * * * * * | * * * * * * * * * * * | | | |
| ZONING COMMENTS: Staff Member Responsible: John P. Pederson | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Land Use Plan Recommend | ation: Park/Recreation/Conse | rvation (PRC) | | | | |
| Proposed Number of Units: | 22 Overall | Density: 7.85 | Units/Acre | | | |
| Staff estimate for allowable | # of units: 0 Units* 1 | ncrease of: 22 | Units/Lots | | | |

*Estimate could be higher or lower based on engineered plans taking into account topography, shape of property, utilities, roadways, natural features such as creeks, wetlands, etc., and other unforeseen circumstances.

The applicant is requesting the RM-8 zoning district to develop townhouse style condominiums. The tennis facility will be demolished in order to develop the proposal. The units would be traditional in styling with a mixture of exteriors materials, such as brick, stone, shake and hardi-plank. The units will range in size from 2,000 square feet to 3,500 square-feet. The units will sell for \$300,000 to \$400,000. Each unit will have an attached two-car garage.

There is a required 25-foot landscape buffer required along the north property that is not shown.

Cemetery Preservation: No comment.

PRESENT ZONING: RR

PETITION NO.: Z-27

PETITION FOR: RM-8

SCHOOL COMMENTS:

| | | | Number of |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------|------------|
| | | Capacity | Portable |
| Name of School | Enrollment | Status | Classrooms |
| East Side Elementary | 1264 | Over | |
| Elementary Dickerson Middle | 1238 | Over | |
| Middle Walton High | 2732 | Over | |

High

School attendance zones are subject to revision at any time. •

Additional Comments:

Approval of this petition could seriously and adversely affect the enrollment at Walton High School, which is severely over capacity at this time, and it could adversely affect the enrollment at East Side Elementary and Dodgen Middle Schools, which are also over capacity at this time.

FIRE COMMENTS:

GUEST PARKING: When projects contemplate less than 20 foot separation between units, guest parking shall be provided or the streets shall be labeled as a fire lane.

| APPLICANT: | Brooks Chadwick, LLC |
|-------------------|----------------------|
|-------------------|----------------------|

PRESENT ZONING: RR

PLANNING COMMENTS:

The applicant is requesting a rezoning from RR to RM-8 for single-family attached residential units. The 2.802 acre site is located on the southeast side of Audubon Drive, south of Fairfield Drive.

Comprehensive Plan

The parcel is within the Park/Recreation/Conservation (**PRC**) area future land use category, with RR zoning designation. The purpose of the Park/Recreation/Conservation (**PRC**) category is to provide for land dedicated to active or passive recreational uses, either publicly or privately owned including playgrounds, public parks, nature preserves, wildlife management areas, national forests, golf courses, recreation centers, etc.

<u>Master Plan/Corridor Study</u> Not applicable.

Historic Preservation

After consulting various county historic resources surveys, historic maps, archaeology surveys and Civil War trench location maps, staff finds that no known significant historic resources appear to be affected by this application. No further comment. No action by applicant requested at this time.

| <u>Design Guidelines</u> Is the parcel in an area with Design Guidelines? | □ Yes | ■ No |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| If yes, design guidelines area | | |
| Does the current site plan comply with the design r | equirements? | |
| <u>Incentive Zones</u> Is the property within an Opportunity Zone? The Opportunity Zone is an incentive that provides jobs are being created. This incentive is available for | \$3,500 tax cre | |
| Is the property within an Enterprise Zone? The Enterprise Zone is an incentive that provides ta qualifying businesses locating or expanding within | | |
| Is the property eligible for incentives through the C Program? | | Industrial Property Rehabilitation |
| The Commercial and Industrial Property Rehabilita ad valorem property taxes for qualifying redevelop | - | ÷ |
| <u>Special Districts</u> | | |
| Is this property within the Cumberland Special Dis □ Yes ■ No | trict #1 (hotel/r | notel fee)? |

Is this property within the Cumberland Special District #2 (ad valorem tax)?

 \Box Yes \blacksquare No

PETITION FOR: RM-8

| APPLICANT Brooks Chadwick, LLC | | | | PET | TITION NO. Z-027 |
|--|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------|---|
| PRESENT ZONING RR | | | | PET | FITION FOR RM-8 |
| * | * * * | * * * * * * * * | * * | * * * | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * |
| WATER COMMENTS: NOTE: Comments refl | ect on | ly what facilities w | vere | in exi | stence at the time of this review. |
| Available at Development: | | Yes | | | No |
| Fire Flow Test Required: | | Yes | | | No |
| Size / Location of Existing Water Main(s): 8" D | DI/N | side of Audubon | Dri | ve | |
| Additional Comments: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Developer may be required to install/upgrade water mains, based on Review Process. | fire flo | w test results or Fire De | epartn | nent Co | de. This will be resolved in the Plan |
| * | * * > | * * * * * * * * * | * * | * * * | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * |
| SEWER COMMENTS: NOTE: Comments | reflect | only what facilitie | s we | re in e | existence at the time of this review. |
| In Drainage Basin: | ✓ | Yes | | | No |
| At Development: | \checkmark | Yes | | | No |
| Approximate Distance to Nearest Sewer: on | site | | | | |
| Estimated Waste Generation (in G.P.D.): A | D F= | +3360 | | Р | Peak= +8400 |
| Treatment Plant: | | Sutton | | | |
| Plant Capacity: | ✓ | Available | | Not | Available |
| Line Capacity: | ✓ | Available | | Not | Available |
| Proiected Plant Availability: | ✓ | 0 - 5 vears | | 5 - 1 | 0 vears \Box over 10 vears |
| Drv Sewers Required: | | Yes | ✓ | No | |
| Off-site Easements Required: | | Yes* | \checkmark | No | *If off-site easements are required, Developer must submit easements to CCWS for |
| Flow Test Required: | | Yes | ✓ | No | review/approval as to form and stipulations prior to the execution of easements by the |
| Letter of Allocation issued: | | Yes | ✓ | No | property owners. All easement acquisitions are the responsibility of the Developer |
| Septic Tank Recommended by this Department | : | Yes | \checkmark | No | · |
| Subject to Health Department Approval: | | Yes | ✓ | No | |
| Additional Redevelopment. Existing buildin Comments: | ig cor | nnected to sewer | | | |

Developer will be responsible for connecting to the existing County water and sewer systems, installing and/or upgrading all outfalls and water mains, obtaining on and/or offsite easements, dedication of on and/or offsite water and sewer to Cobb County, as may be required. Rezoning does not guarantee water/sewer availability/capacity unless so stated in writing by the Cobb County Water System. Permit issuances subject to continued treatment plant compliance with EPD discharge requirements.

APPLICANT: Brooks Chadwick, LLC

PETITION NO.: <u>Z-27</u>

PRESENT ZONING: RR

PETITION FOR: RM-8

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

| FLOOD HAZARD: YES NO POSSIBLY, NOT VERIFIED |
|--|
| DRAINAGE BASIN: <u>Bishop Creek</u> FLOOD HAZARD INFO: Zone X FEMA Designated 100 year Floodplain Flood. Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance DESIGNATED FLOOD HAZARD. Project subject to the Cobb County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Requirements. Dam Breach zone from (upstream) (onsite) lake - need to keep residential buildings out of hazard. |
| <u>WETLANDS:</u> \Box YES \boxtimes NO \Box POSSIBLY, NOT VERIFIED |
| Location: |
| The Owner/Developer is responsible for obtaining any required wetland permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer. |
| STREAMBANK BUFFER ZONE: YES NO POSSIBLY, NOT VERIFIED |
| Metropolitan River Protection Area (within 2000' of Chattahoochee River) ARC (review 35' undisturbed buffer each side of waterway). Chattahoochee River Corridor Tributary Area - County review (<u>undisturbed</u> buffer each side). Georgia Erosion-Sediment Control Law and County Ordinance - County Review/State Review. Georgia DNR Variance may be required to work in 25 foot streambank buffers. County Buffer Ordinance: 50', 75', 100' or 200' each side of creek channel. |
| DOWNSTREAM CONDITION |
| Potential or Known drainage problems exist for developments downstream from this site. Stormwater discharges must be controlled not to exceed the capacity available in the downstream storm drainage system. Minimize runoff into public roads. Minimize the effect of concentrated stormwater discharges onto adjacent properties. Developer must secure any R.O.W required to receive concentrated discharges where none exist naturally |
| Existing Lake Downstream Additional BMP's for erosion sediment controls will be required. Lake Study needed to document sediment levels. Stormwater discharges through an established residential neighborhood downstream. |

Project engineer must evaluate the impact of increased volume of runoff generated by the proposed project on downstream receiving systems.

APPLICANT: Brooks Chadwick, LLC

PETITION NO.: <u>Z-27</u>

PRESENT ZONING: <u>RR</u>

PETITION FOR: <u>RM-8</u>

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMENTS – Continued

SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS

| | Provide comprehensive | hydrology/stormy | vater controls to inc | clude development | of out parcels. |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| _ | | | | | |

- \boxtimes Submit all proposed site improvements to Plan Review.
- Any **spring activity** uncovered must be addressed by a qualified geotechnical engineer (PE).
- Structural fill _____ must be placed under the direction of a qualified registered Georgia geotechnical engineer (PE).
- Existing facility.
- Project must comply with the Water Quality requirements of the CWA-NPDES-NPS Permit and County Water Quality Ordinance.
- Water Quality/Quantity contributions of the existing lake/pond on site must be continued as baseline conditions into proposed project.
- Calculate and provide % impervious of project site.
- Revisit design; reduce pavement area to reduce runoff and pollution.

INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

No Stormwater controls shown

Copy of survey is not current – Additional comments may be forthcoming when current site conditions are exposed.

No site improvements showing on exhibit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- 1. The site is currently developed as a swim/tennis center with an existing impervious coverage of approximately 55%. The site is surrounded by existing single-family and townhome residences. The site is relatively flat and drains via several flow paths including an existing pipe system and several small swales through the adjacent developments.
- 2. The proposed RM-8 development will reduce the impervious coverage by approximately 15%. Water quality will be provided by a series of raingarden/infiltration areas. No detention is proposed due to the proposed reduction of runoff, however, this must be approved by the Stormwater Division Manager.

PRESENT ZONING: <u>RR</u> PETITION FOR: <u>RM-8</u>

TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS

The following comments and recommendations are based on field investigation and office review of the subject rezoning case:

| ROADWAY | AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS | ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION | SPEED LIMIT | JURISDICTIONAL CONTROL | MIN. R.O.W. REQUIREMENTS |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Audubon Drive | N/A | Local | 25 mph | Cobb County | 50' |
| | | | | | |

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

Audubon Drive is classified as a local and according to the available information the existing right-of-way does meet the minimum requirements for this classification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend curb and gutter along both sides and sidewalk along one side of proposed development roadway.

Recommend sidewalk along the Audubon Drive frontage.

Recommend applicant verify that minimum intersection sight distance is available for ingress and egress maneuvers for the site if it is not, implement remedial measures, subject to the Department's approval, to achieve the minimum requirement of 280'.

Recommend applicant be required to meet all Cobb County Development Standards and Ordinances related to project improvements.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT **BLANK**

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Z-27 BROOKS CHADWICK, LLC

- A. It is Staff's opinion that the applicant's rezoning proposal will not permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby properties. The applicant proposal would be much more dense then adjacent residential developments. There are two townhouse developments that have lower densities; Pinecrest townhomes has a density of 4.95 units per acre, while Fawn Ridge townhomes has a density of 6.26 units per acre. There are three single family detached housing developments that are Indian Hills (1.75 units per acre), Fawn Hills at Indian Hills unit 1 (2.79 units per acre, and Pinecrest unit 1 (2.64 units per acre).
- B. It is Staff's opinion that the applicant's rezoning proposal will not have an adverse affect on the usability of adjacent or nearby property. However, staff is concerned that the proposal's density would be out of character with the developed density around the proposal.
- C. It is Staff's opinion that the applicant's rezoning proposal will not result in a use which would cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools. This opinion can be supported by the departmental comments contained in this analysis.
- D. It is Staff's opinion that the applicant's rezoning proposal is not in conformity with the policy and intent of the *Cobb County Comprehensive Plan*, which delineates this property to be within a Park/Recreation/Conservation (PRC) Land Use Designation. Outside of the PRC designation the balance of the property is surrounded by Low Density Residential
- E. It is Staff's opinion that there are existing and changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for approving the applicant's rezoning proposal, but at a lower density. There is other attached housing on adjacent property to the south, but the density is lower as stated in paragraph A of this recommendation. The proposal has single family houses on the north, east and west property lines with density ranging from 1.75 units per acre to 2.79 units per acre. Staff would recommend that density be reduced to 5 units per acre, which would yield 14 lots. This density would be in the approximate middle of the densities that currently exists and would fit the character of the area better.

Based on the above analysis, Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to the following conditions:

- Maximum of 5 units per acre, which yields 14 lots;
- 25 foot landscape buffer be installed along the north property line adjacent to the R-20 zoned properties;
- Final site plan be approved by the District Commissioner;
- Fire Department comments and recommendations;
- Water and Sewer Division comments and recommendations;
- Stormwater Management Division comments and recommendations;
- Department of Transportation comments and recommendations.

The recommendations made by the Planning and Zoning Staff are only the opinions of the Planning and Zoning Staff and are by no means the final decision. The Cobb County Board of Commissioners makes the final decisions on all Rezoning and Land Use Permits at an advertised public hearing.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT **BLANK**

| | | | | AMULTICE | | | |
|---------|----------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------|
| | | | | OBB COUL | Арг | plication #: <u>z-27(</u> | 2014) |
| C | OBB CO | UNTY GEORGIA | | | PC | Hearing Date: 05/06 | /2014 |
| | | D IN OFFICE | | | BO | C Hearing Date05/20 | /2014 |
| 2 | 014 MAR | -6 PM 4:10 | | OF GE | | 0 | |
| COB | B COUNT | Y ZOWING DIVISION | | - C T 4 4 C | | * | |
| | | Sun | imary | of Intent f | or Rezoni | ng | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Part 1. | Residen | _ | | additional information | <i>,</i> | | |
| | a) | | | 2,000 - 3,500 | | | |
| | b) | Proposed building | | | | l <mark>k, stone, s</mark> hake, e | etc. |
| | c) | | | \$300's - \$400 | | | |
| | d) | | | <u>Waiver of req</u> | uired 30 feet b | etween | |
| | str | uctures to 20 | feet. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Part 2. | | | | tach additional informa | tion if needed) | | |
| | a) | Proposed use(s): | Not A | pplicable | | | |
| | 1.) | D | | | | | |
| | b) | Proposed building | architecture: | Not Applicable | | | |
| | | Duo no co d h como (do | | | | | |
| | c) | Proposed hours/da | ys of operation | Not Applic | able | | |
| | d) | List all requested v | ariances | NT - 1 - 1 - 1 - | | | |
| | u) | List an requested v | | Not Applic | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Part | 3. Other | · Pertinent Informat | ion (List or at | tach additional inform: | ution if needed) | | |
| | | | | | non n needed) | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Part 4 | . Is any | of the property inclu | ded on the pr | oposed site plan owned | by the Local. State. o | r Federal Government? | |
| | | | - | | • | remnants, etc., and attach | а |
| | | | | es are located). No. | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| ••••• | | | | | | | |
| Part 5 | | | | rcement action? No X | ;Yes(If yes, attac | h a copy of the | |
| | Nonce | of Violation and/or ta MOORE | | HNSON & STEELE, | LLP | | |
| | Applies | nt signature: <u>BY</u> : | Shal | Im | ── Date:March 6 | 5, 2014 | |
| | | | ~ | | | .,, | |
| | Applica | nt name (printed): | | Moore; Georgia B s for Applicant | | mer | |
| ***** | innet | epocifically - | - | * * | * <i>2</i> | | ho |
| Sum | ary of | Intent for Re | eserves the zoning, of | r any other part | of the Applica | ion set _R forthuin, that ion for Rezoning, | ,2013 , |

at any time during the rezoning process.