

REZONING

13-0001

RZ12-11, CV12-06 and 12-05

TAPESTRY HOUSE EXPANSION-THE JENNINGS GROUP

2715 & 2725 Holcomb Bridge Road

Land Lot: 824

Jackie Deibel stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone from Fulton County Annexed to OP, which is office-professional and they are also asking for a conditional use and several variances with this request. As one can see from the aerial the existing Tapestry House is one story, 32 beds. The applicant purchased the property that is somewhat vacant next door. The entire two parcels will be zoned OP with this application. Deibel presented a copy of the zoning map. It is currently zoned Fulton County Annexed.

The applicant is proposing a 60,000 sq. ft, three-story building with a basement to somewhat attach with the existing Tapestry House now. The proposed building will contain 68 beds. The current Tapestry building has 32 beds and is one story.

There are three variances that the applicant is asking for. Two of the variances relate to the existing property line and buffer related to the existing building. The Fulton County zoning required a 25-foot buffer with a 35-foot setback. By zoning to OP, Roswell requires a 40-foot buffer with a 50-foot setback. But since the building is existing they are recommending approval of the variance to allow the building to remain. The third variance relates to height. The plan that the applicant submitted shows three different sections labeled A, B and C. The applicant is looking to do a three-story building with a basement. The OP zoning allows for 40 feet with three stories. Technically, Jackie Deibel stated that she will let the applicant answer the height questions. She thinks that he will be able to explain it a little bit better than she can as to how it will look from the street.

The staff is recommending approval of the rezoning, conditional use and the concurrent variances for this application with two conditions:

1. To the site plan dated March 7, 2013.
2. For a combination plat to be done prior to a land disturbance permit to bring both parcels under one property.

Jackie Deibel asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission.

Lisa DeCarbo stated that one of her questions is she saw that there were quite a few comments from the Design Review Board and since that time the site plan has been revised. Would this go back in front of DRB? Jackie Deibel stated that it would. The Design Review Board has the final look at the architecture and landscaping and they did take a lot of the comments from the DRB into consideration because the building prior was a lot larger and it was pushed back. They have made the building smaller. They have attached it in a sense the way DRB wanted. They also have met the steep slopes which



DRAFT

was a major concern. They have met with Jean Rearick several times and worked through the steep slopes issues, storm water issues. They have also satisfied the fire and transportation departments because transportation didn't want to see three curb cuts. They now only have two.

Lisa DeCarbo thanked Jackie Deibel. Cheryl Greenway asked if there any additional questions for the city.

Cheryl Greenway stated that Jackie Deibel talked about meeting the requirements. She sees also in here some fire hydrant requirements. Have those been met and complied with or is that still an issue? Deibel stated that will be dealt with at the time of LDP. Greenway asked about the sidewalk. There was a thing from the Roswell Transportation Department to provide sidewalk connectivity from Holcomb Bridge Road sidewalk to building entrances. Is that an issue?

Jackie Deibel stated that she might have to have the applicant answer that but if that is done it will have to be done at the time of the Land Disturbance Permit time period. Jackie Deibel did not know if the applicant addressed that portion. They might have to have the applicant answer that question.

Hearing no further questions for the city Cheryl Greenway asked the applicant to please come forward. She thanked Jackie Deibel.

Tim Watford with Peacock Partnership stated that they were a design and construction firm in Atlanta and they are representing Insignia Senior Living and the Tapestry House expansion. First of all, Watford stated that he would like to thank the staff for the city of Roswell Community Development. These guys have been helpful in working with them through this process. That has been much appreciated. He would also like to go over at this point any of the pieces of the project that maybe they don't understand from a presentation. He will be happy to go through it. Jackie Deibel covered most of it as it relates to the pertinent information and that is that they are currently 32 beds. The existing property is zoned as is to go up to 75. They have purchased the property next door which puts them at 5.94 as a total. In essence they are asking for 25 additional beds for a total of 100 beds on both sites combined.

Watford stated that the existing zoning for the Fulton County Annexed can accommodate 60,000 square feet of office. That is currently what that site plan is approved for. However, the applicant is looking for 60,000 square feet of the assisted living facility instead. He thinks it is important for them to point out that from a solid tax base that this project would be a solid tax base for the city of Roswell. It has an incredibly low impact on traffic in lieu of office space. It has essentially no impact on the school systems as it relates to use by these residents. It will have a very low utility consumption and basically good, quiet neighbors. So, from a reasonable and consistent zoning to what is there right now as it relates to the existing Tapestry House, Watford feels like it is a very good neighbor, very strong neighbor.

Tim Watford mentioned that Jackie Deibel did mention the height, the variance that they are looking for. He would like to try to explain that. The Commission did receive a secondary sheet tonight. There was a typographical error in the cross sections. The first thing to notice about the site is from the crown of Holcomb Bridge Road there is about 50 feet in drop between the crown of Holcomb Bridge Road and the lowest point on the site, which is right here. It is basically a bowl, if one will, like a horseshoe. What the applicant has done is they have tried to take advantage of that slope and basically bury a portion of the building into the slope itself. So, when Deibel mentioned four floors or three floors and a basement, the basement is only over this portion right here, which if one looks at the existing contours is a low dip in the site. It is an opportunity for them to capture some space for amenities and for engineering, for HVAC, for mechanical systems related to the facility and then the three primary floors will be dedicated to the residents, the units and the amenities for them.

So hopefully what this is showing is this section, which is A, which is the top section and it is looking back toward Holcomb Bridge Road. One can notice here that from a height perspective, Holcomb Bridge Road is beyond this point in elevation somewhere around 15 feet greater than this third level. So, from the road primarily one is going to see two floors. That is all he is going to see. Coming in from maybe this angle if one is not going 50 mph, he might be able to see a portion of a third floor right here. But, for the most part two floors are what one is going to see versus four. So, that is the reason they are asking for the height variance.

Even at three floors, because they are having a pitched roof and the way that has to be measured, the floors are three and/or 40 feet. So, even at four floors they would have to ask for a height variance because of the way one has to measure a pitched roof. That is really more designed for a flat roof and that just doesn't make sense for what they are doing in keeping with the architectural style that is already existing on the site.

Tim Watford stated that Section C again is a cross section looking back toward Holcomb Bridge Road and one can see the crown of Holcomb Bridge Road and how high that is and looking back again seeing primarily two of the three floors that are for the residents. So, hopefully that answers the height questions, by showing those sections to give one an idea of sort of how that site works from a bowl.

And then again, Jackie Deibel of course talked about the existing conditions that they really can't do much about at this point. And that is simply just changing from the annexed to OP, which has a different buffer and setback.

Tim Watford asked if there were any questions for him.

Lisa DeCarbo stated that in looking at the new proposed building, on the diagram it would be the upper left corner. It looks like they might have a setback issue at that property line.



DRAFT

Tim Watford stated that they do not. It is a side yard and it is commercial. The residential is basically on these borders right here and they are the only portions that are residential. This is commercial. Weed Pro is their neighbor next door and then the new Immediate Med Physician's Center is also a triangular piece that comes in and touches. So, they are commercial on those three sides there.

Lisa DeCarbo thanked Tim Watford.

Cheryl Greenway asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. Cheryl Greenway asked if the applicant had any comment about the sidewalk requirements.

Tim Watford stated that certainly from a sidewalk perspective they have sidewalks running because there will be new decel lanes here that will be implemented based on the current setback. The existing entry piece is here so there will be sidewalks along this section here. Certainly from a connectivity...they can certainly connect and cross a part of the parking lot from a sidewalk perspective. He is not sure he understands the exact question other than certainly from an accessibility they will be able to walk from the sidewalk onto the property and to the front door. He is not sure that they will have a sidewalk in the pavement per se because the elevations, while they do vary what they are trying to do is raise that portion of the site parking-wise that will still be about four feet below Holcomb Bridge Road's crown of the street. They certainly can work in detail with those guys to get more specific if they need that.

Cheryl Greenway stated that she understood. The other question that she has is with the development of this property, does that affect any access to any of the other businesses in the area. She knows that there used to be a road that kind of cut through a little strange there.

Tim Watford stated that was a good question. It does not. Actually they have been working with Jeff here who is one of the owners of Weed Pro. They have a flag lot right here and basically there is a cross easement that comes onto their existing property and half of it on their property and that is a current access drive. So working with transportation and the fire department what the applicant looks to do and have agreed to do is to basically improve that existing entry way, which is somewhat of a driveway and make it into a full-fledge DOT entry/exit point. Again, that was something that the fire department wanted to have so that they could pull a fire truck in and pull right back out. They traded that for...there are basically three entrances right now and at the beginning of the project they had those three maintaining. They have gone to two through their request. He thinks they can make that work out work out pretty well for that.

Cheryl Greenway thanked Tim Watford.

Bryan Chamberlain stated that going back to the sidewalk issue he wants to understand the parking lot. Is it pretty well level from that western entrance in? So, it would appear

 **DRAFT**

to him that basically striping it from the sidewalk if one has the appropriate ramp down from the sidewalk to the parking lot should meet those needs. Shouldn't it?

Tim Watford agreed.

Harvey Smith stated that the tree recompense plan, he knows that the applicant has met with the arborist and he sees his comments. Most of the clearing is going to occur of course where the new building is. But, it looks satisfactory. Smith guessed that the arborist is good with the proposed tree recompense plan and what Watford plans to do their.

Tim Watford stated that it is. Basically he is very satisfied. Again, part of combining the nearly six acres together they are going to wind up with...if one is familiar with the site it is heavily wooded in this area right here. In fact, they have a 100-foot buffer ring that is right here. So, there are quite a few trees in this area so from a recompense they have really more than made up for it and they have a tree plan that picks up anything that was taken out as it relates to caliper and tree count.

Cheryl Greenway asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. Hearing none at this time she thanked the applicant and told him to come back up after the audience has had a chance to comment.

Cheryl Greenway asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to come up and speak in favor of the applicant. For the record, no one came forward. She asked if there was anyone that would like to come up and speak in opposition of the applicant. Again, no one came forward.

Greenway asked if there were any other questions by the Planning Commission either of the applicant or the city.

Cheryl Greenway stated that she knows for the facility that the applicant is building there are certain requirements from different regulatory agencies they have to adhere to. But one concern she has is the property being right there on a busy road and if one is dealing with patients with Alzheimer's which is just something that Greenway is sensitive to from a mother that had it. Is that going to be on a separate floor or some type of lockdown so that they cannot get out and accidentally wander into the traffic?

Tim Watford stated that it will. They have from an operation's perspective they have regulations and requirements in place. Two things that they are looking at are whether or not from a memory care they locate those on an upper floor which is one of those things they typically do. Makes it a little more challenging for them to get in and out. The other is to look at because of the existing facility, which is basically for lack of a better term, "down in the hole" as one drives by he basically sees the roof top. It would easier at this point, too to look at sequestering part of that facility as well from a managing it. Not as

many people in and out of it. They are maximum 32 versus 68. So, that is something operationally that they have to be very sensitive to and certainly will in the future.

Cheryl Greenway stated that she just wanted to make sure it had been addressed. She thanked Tim Watford. She asked if there were any other questions for the applicant or the city.

Lisa DeCarbo stated that she noticed that the property is currently limited to an additional two-story building and 75 units. In the 75 units, it says it is for both the new and existing facility. And the applicant is saying that by assembling these parcels somehow that doesn't apply anymore. Can Watford talk a little bit more on that point?

Tim Watford stated that basically this existing piece of property right here, Tapestry House as it is right now on the land that it is on, without buying the additional acre-and-a-half was entitled to 75. So, they are basically abandoning that as far as expanding that facility because they were able to get the land and just grow a new facility expansion.

Lisa DeCarbo clarified that it is not 75 for both the new and old parcel, it is for the new and the old facility and by having the larger parcel it allows them to get to the 100. Tim Watford stated that was correct. That would be the total including the existing 32. 68+32. DeCarbo thanked Watford, she just wanted to clarify.

Cheryl Greenway asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, she closed the public portion of the discussion. She asked if there were any comments or a motion by the members of the Planning Commission.

Harvey Smith stated that the only comment he has is a positive one. He thinks it is a very good application for the use. It is suited, it has minimal impact, there is so much traffic on that road as it is. Smith concurs with the comments that there is an existing facility there; it is just an expansion of that. He really does not have any issues with it other than there is going to be a lot of specimen trees there, the tree recompense, there is a good plan that Smith is sure the arborist will approve. But Smith has no qualms with it. He thinks it is a good project.

Lisa DeCarbo concurred. She thinks it is a good typology for that area. She thinks it is something that they need a lot of and having it attached to an existing facility is even better. One of the things that she thinks is very important since there is such a sea of parking up front right along Holcomb Bridge Road. She would like to be sure that whatever the landscape plan that is there is nice. Because they are taking out a fairly heavily wooded area there and she would love to see that still look pretty good. Because that is a heavy commercial corridor and it is not always kept as nicely as it should be. But it looks like Watford is well on his way.

Cheryl Greenway called for a motion.

Motion

Joe Piontek made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that Roswell mayor and city council grant approval for the property located in Land Lot 824, the First District, Second Section containing 5.94 acres of the requested rezoning and conditional use with concurrent variances to allow for an assisted living facility per case RZ12-11, CU12-05 and CV12-06 located at 2715 and 2725 Holcomb Bridge Road.

Harvey Smith seconded the motion.

Cheryl Greenway asked Joe Piontek about the conditions that were listed by staff regarding the two conditions that they listed. Joe Piontek stated that they were included in that. Greenway stated that she just wanted to clarify that the motion included that.

Cheryl Greenway called the question.

The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

REZONING

12-0151

RZ12-05, CV12-02

EAH INVESTMENTS

12160 Etris Road

Land Lot: 1236

Brad Townsend stated that this rezoning was before the Planning Commission last year. It went in front of council; it was approved for R-1. The applicant then decided a law suit was appropriate. He decided to sue the city of Roswell. That litigation went into discussions with the council members, the neighboring homeowners and the applicant. And they have come to an understanding to rezone the property to R-1 on the west side of Etris Road and R-2 on the east side of Etris Road for a total of 27 single-family detached homes. The location of the property if the Commission can remember is separated by Etris Road as single-family and large lots along it and around it an unimproved Kent Road to the south. Townsend presented the aerial photograph of the existing property showing the large parcels.

Brad Townsend stated that the revised site plan with the settlement is what is before the Planning Commission this evening. This is a site plan schematic of what is included as part of the settlement. Actually that is the long one, that is the wrong plan. Townsend stated that he has it somewhere. Just a second.

Brad Townsend stated that this should be the plan that is in the Commission's backup material indicating the three lots on the west side of Etris, 24 lots on the west side of Etris., three lots on the east side of Etris, the two cul-de-sacs, the connection to the property to the north, fire connection to the property to Kent Road to the south.

 **DRAFT**