

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Community Development and Transportation Committee  
**FROM:** Alice Wakefield, Community Development Director  
**DATE:** March 19, 2013  
**SUBJECT:** Appeal of Section 2.1.6.A, Standard Construction Specifications

---

### **Request:**

The applicant is appealing Section 2.1.6.A, Standard Construction Specifications to allow a second curb on a lot with less than 200 feet of frontage.

### **Background:**

Mr. Kelvin McDuffie purchased property located at 775 Winnmark Court in The Heritage section of the Horseshoe Bend Subdivision. The subject property has less than 200 feet of frontage. The property has only 67.54 feet of frontage. In accordance with Mr. McDuffie's email he would like to have a circular drive with two driveways. The City of Roswell Standard Construction Specifications (Section 2.1.6.A) states, in part, "*When the property frontage is less than two hundred (200) feet, only one driveway shall be considered for approval.*" Therefore, he is appealing the requirement for 200 feet of frontage to allow for a second driveway.

Mr. McDuffie made an inquiry about installing a circular drive way across front of the home prior to his purchase last year. His hope was that he would be allowed to install a driveway similar to the home next door at 765 Winnmark Court. He indicated wants the make the improvement to provide additional parking for guest and family since his family frequently entertains. Without the improvement, Mr. McDuffie is concern about causing congestion with parking along street side. Mr. Duffie was aware the regulations may not allow for the second drive. Mr. McDuffie has provided two options for the layout of the driveway, which are attached.

City Code (Section 7.1.5) states that appeals to the standard construction specifications must be made to the Mayor and City Council. Mr. McDuffie submitted a formal appeal via email (attached) to City Clerk of Roswell on February 26, 2013.

### **Staff Comments:**

#### **Roswell Department of Transportation (RDOT):**

RDOT provided the following comments forward to the appellant:

The applicant wants the current circular driveway concept as option 1, but has also submitted option 2. There are no significant traffic safety issues for Transportation to address. Transportation is not opposed to either. But the following issues/concerns needs to be address, in the event the variance is granted:

1. The low point of that street seems to be along your site frontage. I did not notice any drainage structure. The additional impervious surface will increase runoff ponding at that location.
2. The City promotes context sensitive. Section 2.1.1 of the City manual. The new driveway material will have to match the existing driveway material used in this community.
3. The City standard width for residential one-way driveway is 14 feet minimum to 18 feet maximum.
4. Maneuvering around the new driveway will be very tight as show on Option 1. It shapes like a cul-de-sac, which requires a 50' radius by City standard.
5. Homeowners Association Approval, if required in your community, shall be obtained separately.

Environmental and Public Works Department:

No comments to date

*Staff's recommendation is that this appeal be placed on the April 8, 2013 Mayor and Council agenda for consideration:*

Attachments: