

Councilmember Diamond asked if the cars are able to park as close as they are indicated on the map and does this fall under the Unified Development Code. Mr. Townsend replied that the cars will be able to park. There will be serious grading and retaining walls and landscaping. He believes it meets the UDC for the buffer landscaping adjacent to the parking lot which is the way the proposed plan is and with the cars behind that area.

Mayor Wood said he has no objection to this variance and noted that when the "fall zone" was originally drafted, the intent was to prevent the construction of a structure. But they never anticipated prohibiting parking under the "fall zone."

Mayor Wood asked to hear from the applicant.

**Applicant:**

**Sam Stone** with United Development Services stated he was representing Carland Automotive Group, specifically Honda Carland. He stated that the applicant already has a parking problem and they project selling 3,600 cars in 2015. They also service 700 cars per week and park 150 employees per day. Mayor Wood said the City appreciates the number of employees they bring to Roswell and the cars they sell and the taxes they pay. Mr. Stone said as does Carland. Mr. Stone continued and said they would not be building any structures in this location; only parking cars to help sell, service and employ more people.

Public comment invited. None were made.

**Motion:** Councilmember Wynn made a motion for approval of **V 20140345 - Variance to Article 5.4.14 of the City Code, Hazardous Occupancies, Honda Carland**. Councilmember Orlans seconded.

**Further Council Comment:**

Councilmember Price asked if the road would be realigned there. Mr. Townsend replied that is correct. Councilmember Price said the billboard is not moving but the road is also going to come in closer to it than it was. Mr. Townsend displayed a graphic on the overhead and pointed out an orange line that is the current right-of-way line and the blue line that is a future right-of-way line. He said the future right-of-way is moving closer to the base of the billboard. Councilmember Price said there will actually be more moving traffic in the fall line. Mr. Townsend replied yes. Councilmember Price thanked Mr. Townsend.

**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Approval of a Text Amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC), Section 10.2, Landscaping and Screening, Section 10.2.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Buffer table. (First Reading)**

Planning and Zoning Director Brad Townsend presented this item stating this is a text amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC) proposing to amend Table 10.2.3, Neighborhood Compatibility to add a C/D buffer under the PRD column as well as for future PRD's in that location. This has gone to the Planning Commission and there was a lot of discussion related to the details of how that would be implemented.

**Council Comment:**

Councilmember Dippolito said one of the reasons for this change was to clarify their discussions during the UDC process that when a PRD was up against another zoning category or another

PRD, the buffer between the two would be dependent on what the actual lot sizes were on either side of that shared property line. The way this is written with first of all the absence of a PRD to PRD buffer was just an oversight. But there is also a note at the bottom with an asterisk that says "PRD buffer is based on existing development." He said he thought that was a little too vague and he sent language to Brad Townsend and Councilmember Wynn earlier today suggesting to expand on that to allow that if there is an existing PRD abutting a new proposed residential category or vice versa if there is a new PRD coming up against residential or if it is PRD with PRD, they would look at those two with what the lot sizes are and then define what that buffer should be from there. That is important because if there is a PRD that is a townhouse project going up against another PRD that is a townhouse project there is no reason to have a large buffer between the two. It is really a function of looking at what the various lot sizes are. He proposed having some additional language for the second reading that expands on that note that allows flexibility so there is not always a 40' buffer even if there are like uses butting against one another.

Councilmember Wynn said she had already talked to Brad Townsend and David Davidson to come up with some precise wording for Councilmember Dippolito. They are working on that and will send the wording to him before the second reading. They understand what he is suggesting and are working on the language.

Councilmember Igleheart asked Councilmember Dippolito for clarification and said, "If it were smaller units...it would not have a C or D? Or it would still be the C or D; it would just be more determined based on the lot sizes." Councilmember Dippolito said it is really dependent on what the lot sizes are on either side of that shared property line. For example, if there are 12,000 sq. ft. lots on either side of a shared property line, there is no reason to have a 40' buffer because if there is an RS-12 against an RS-12 essentially there would not be a buffer. By virtue of that fact, putting in a PRD should not penalize having to put in that additional buffer. Councilmember Igleheart said he understands but his clarification is so it would not necessarily be C or D based on that. Councilmember Dippolito said that is correct; it could be an A or B buffer or C or D or no buffer and would be dependent on what is adjacent. The best thing to do would be to compare what those lot sizes are within the chart that has been established.

Mayor Wood said he was confident that wording could be worked out before this comes back for the next vote. Councilmember Dippolito said it is not as complicated as it sounds.

Councilmember Igleheart said he understands that and what he thought which was clearly wrong was that the PRD was something that was set because it is a pretty big area wherever it happens to be. But as they are seeing, a PRD can be done in a pretty small area; just put a couple different things in there and call it a PRD. He thinks it is a loophole to allow people to get around that and then put something right next to it whether it is necessarily the right thing or not. He was concerned about still having that loophole which he thought they were trying to fix.

Councilmember Dippolito asked Councilmember Igleheart if his concern is that someone would put in, for example, RS-4 and then along the one property line they might put RS-12 just to avoid having the buffer. Councilmember Igleheart said right. Councilmember Dippolito said he had thought about that also but the more he thought about it; within the proposed development, those units need to be saleable so the neighborhood needs to be designed in a way where people would want to live. Someone might not want to buy a large lot in a neighborhood where across the street everything is small lot; perhaps they would but there should be some sort of progression or

continuity within the new development. He said to Councilmember Igleheart that he had thought about that as well and whether that creates an issue.

Councilmember Igleheart said generally except for a couple of cases, the existing PRDs that he thought they were trying to protect are the largest subdivisions. He said this talks about impacting those. He said the reason he wanted to put the C/D in was to make sure they have that protection. He did not disagree with what Councilmember Dippolito is saying as long as they make sure they do not allow what Councilmember Dippolito had just talked about.

Councilmember Diamond said the RS-4 and RS-12 up against each other already triggers the C/D. She suggested instead of putting C/D in the PRD to PRD slot, just put the asterisk and refer to the note at the bottom to read "buffer is based on existing abutting development."

Councilmember Igleheart said what he thinks Councilmember Dippolito means is that they would have the size; it would be a PRD overall but it would not be designated as an RS-4 or RS-9 or RS-12.

Councilmember Diamond said she thought they were saying the same thing and she hopes they can do it somehow on this chart without a long...(remainder inaudible).

Mayor Wood said they should wait to see how the chart looks.

Councilmember Igleheart said the reason for having the discussion is because they don't want this to have to come back to Council for discussion all over again because it turns out to not be what they thought or hoped it should be. Councilmember Diamond agreed and said she feels they are all saying the same thing.

Councilmember Wynn said hopefully staff will have wording to Council very soon. She thinks they have guidance of where the Council wants to go and they will be glad to send out wording on that and let the Mayor and Council look at the wording to make sure everyone is comfortable with it.

Mayor Wood suggested if there is not a consensus by the next meeting that it be deferred again until they reach consensus.

Councilmember Wynn said that is why she would try to get this to Council well beforehand so they have time to look at it. There is not really a time line on this; it is just a little house cleaning. She asked everyone to be patient and said staff will get the re-writes out for Council's thoughts.

City Attorney David Davidson conducted the first reading of ***AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 10 OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE, SECTION 10.2.3 TO ADD THE C/D BUFFER REQUIREMENT BETWEEN NEW PROJECTS PRD'S AND EXISTING PRD'S*** stating: pursuant to their authority, the Mayor and City Council adopt the following ordinance:

1.

Article 10, Site Development, Section 10.2 Landscaping and Screening, Section 10.2.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Buffers table, to add PRD under the new project column and to add a type C/D buffer under the PRD column.

Mr. Davidson noted that if approved this would be the first reading.

There was no further discussion from Council. Public comment invited. None were made.

**Motion:** Councilmember Wynn made a motion for **Approval of a Text Amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC), Section 10.2, Landscaping and Screening, Section 10.2.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Buffer table.** Councilmember Diamond seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Environmental / Public Works Department – Councilmember Rich Dippolito**

**5. Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a Joint Funding Agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for a Big Creek Flood Inundation Model in the amount of \$39,450.**

Councilmember Dippolito introduced this item and noted that he expressed some concerns over this during Committee. Subsequent to that he met with Stu Moring and Alice Champagne who gave him more information that he was thankful to receive and noted that he is now in support of this.

Environmental/Public Works Director Stu Moring presented this item stating this agreement with the USGS allows them to develop on behalf of the City, a flood inundation model on Big Creek. Currently, as does most communities, the City has flood maps which are static. They designate what would be the furthest extent of a “100 year storm.” This model would provide real time inundation for a given storm so that there could be a better understanding of the nature of river mechanics as the water is rising and would provide real time information to emergency management staff and Transportation Department about the prospects for inundation of particular areas in a specific storm. This has been done in a few locations around the metropolitan area. USGS determined the need for this kind of real time information following the storms in September 2009. This would serve on Big Creek and the watershed and would be made available to the City of Roswell and the City of Alpharetta. The cost sharing arrangement would call for the City of Roswell to pay a share of \$39,450. The funding is available for that in the Stormwater Utility Fund. The details are spelled out in the agenda item. Staff recommends approval of this agreement. This would serve as an element of the watershed improvement program and satisfaction of the NPDES permit.

**Council Comment:**

Councilmember Price asked if the City of Alpharetta is contributing the same amount as the City of Roswell. Stu Moring replied yes. Councilmember Price said between the cities it is about 80% and the USGS is about 20%. Stu Moring replied no mam; the USGS will contribute \$23,300 on each project and their net share is \$46,600. Councilmember Price asked, “And we are not considered one entity then once it’s established?” Stu Moring said it is one project; the funding is broken up as a mechanism to engage both cities. Councilmember Price said then it is approximately 60/40 each city. Stu Moring said this is correct.

There was no further discussion from Council. Public comment invited. None were made.

**Motion:** Councilmember Dippolito made a motion for **Approval for the Mayor and/or City Administrator to sign a Joint Funding Agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for a Big Creek Flood Inundation Model in the amount of \$39,450.** Councilmember Wynn seconded. The motion passed unanimously.