

Department of Planning & Sustainability

330 Ponce De Leon Avenue, Suite 300 Decatur, GA 30030 (404) 371-2155 or (404) 371-2813(Fax)



Michael L. Thurmond Chief Executive Officer

COMMUNITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission Meeting Date - Tuesday, July 9, 2019 Board of Commissioners Meeting Date - Tuesday, July 23, 2019

| | Deferred Case(s) | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| D1 | TA-19- 1243216 | | DEKALB COUNTY BOARD OF | Comm District: 2 & 6 | | | | | | |
| Approval | | 5-0-0 | Community Council District 1 voted to approve the text Quorum. | amendment, 5-0-0. No | | | | | | |
| Approval | | 5-0-1 | Community Council District 2 voted to approve the text Quorum. | amendment, 5-0-1. No | | | | | | |
| Approval | | 6-0-1 | District 5 CC. No Opposition. 1 Abstain. | | | | | | | |
| Approval | | 9-2-0 | District 4 CC | | | | | | | |
| Approval with Conditions | | 10-0-0 | District 3 CC: Members would like specific criteria to be de facilities. They are concerned about the health effects of e drive-through lanes and safety hazards if a drive- through commercial center and drivers must cross traffic to enter a dr | exhaust from idling cars in facility is located within a | | | | | | |
| D2 | | -19- 5181 | Rose C Evans | Comm District: 5 & 7 | | | | | | |
| Den | Denial 8-0-0 | | No representative present at CC hearing. | | | | | | | |
| D3 | Z-19-1235180 | | Rose C Evans | Comm District: 5 & 7 | | | | | | |
| Denial | | 8-0-0 | Case representative not present to discuss changes in applic | cation. | | | | | | |
| New Case(s) | | | | | | | | | | |
| N1 | SLUP-19- 1243160 | | Xandria Branch | Comm District: 4 & 7 | | | | | | |
| Approva Condit | al with tions | | Council recommended approval with the condition that the SI so that any change in ownership of the establishment would r | | | | | | | |
| N2 | Z-19-1 | 243243 | HUNTER CARSON | Comm District: 3 & 6 | | | | | | |
| Denial | | 10-0-0 | District 3 CC: The recommendation was based on the Board's concern that the zoning proposal would set a negative precedent for the neighborhood and that it would cause property taxes for nearby properties to increase, which would be a hardship for neighbors, especially those who are senior citizens. | | | | | | | |
| N3 | | P-19- 3271 | Tracy Turner | Comm District: 4 & 7 | | | | | | |
| Approval | | 10-1-0 | The community council board recommended approval with or was based on a concern that traffic on Redan Road could en | ne opposing vote which danger the children. | | | | | | |
| N4 | Z-19-1 | 243269 | Strategic Development Partners | Comm District: 3 & 6 | | | | | | |

| Approval | | 7-3-0 | The recommendation of the Community Council is based on the viewpoint that the proposed industrial building would be beneficial to the economic health of south DeKalb County by employing south DeKalb County residents in a variety of managerial and technical jobs. Those voting in opposition expressed views that the rezoning proposal would contribute to an excessive quantity of industrial land in the area, that commercially-zoned land, even if vacant, was preferable to industrial land, and that it would cause 18-wheelers to be too close to the nearby college campus and the nearby hospital. | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------------|---|----------------------|--|
| N5 | 124 | P-19- 3278 | Hole in One Ventures LLC | Comm District: 2 & 6 | |
| Approval with Conditions | | | Community District 2 voted to approve the application 5-1-0 v curb cuts have only right-in/right-out access with a physical b | | |
| N6 | Z-19-1 | 243279 | R. Lawton Jordan Esq | Comm District: 4 & 7 | |
| Approval | | 6-5-0 | | | |
| N7 | | -19- 3310 | Department of Planning & Sustainability | Comm District 2 & 6 | |
| Approval with Conditions | | 10-0-0 | District 5 CC. Revise amendment to state: Reduce 650 square feet minimum to 540 square feet minimum for multi-family senior affordable housing with at least 51% State or Federal funding sources. | | |
| Approval with Conditions | | 5-0-0 | Community Council District 1 voted to approve the text amendment 5-0-0, with condition that reduction of any minimum unit sizes for multi- family housing must be 51% funded for affordable senior housing only and must require approval of a Special Land Use Permit. | | |
| Deferral | | 6-0-0 | Community Council District 2 voted 6-0-0 to defer the application. The Community Council expressed that they support the County's efforts to implement more affordable housing for seniors, however, they would like additional information. Therefore, they recommended full-cycle deferral. | | |
| Denial | | 11-0-0 | District 3 CC recommendation for "Denial" was based on the concerns that the public notice ad did not specify the minimum size to which the units would be reduced, and that if it were specified at 540 square feet, the unit size would be too small, especially for seniors in wheelchairs. | | |
| Denial | | 11-0-0 | District 4 CC. Council recommended denial based on the text amendment being overly broad and possibly unnecessary. The Council indicated that it appears that relief regarding minimum unit size could be sought through the variance process. Council indicated that the maximum 540 square foot requirement could be waived if the project received additional "non-Federal" funding per guidelines of the HUD housing program. Additional comments included: 1. Proposed language would cover any future project that is majority-funded by state or federal government. However, HUD size requirement of 540 sq. ft. cited in Battle letter only applies to apartments that are 100 percent federally funded. Battle letter makes no claim that State Georgia has identical restriction; 2. Proposed language would cover any senior or affordable housing, but the 540 size requirement only applies to HUD Section 202, Supportive Housing for the Elderly; 3. Proposed language does not specify any minimum size and would permit even smaller apartments than 540 sq. ft.; 4. 650 square feet is countywide minimum, why make an exception?; and 5. Issue could be handled by a variance (contrary to Battle letter). Section 202 requirement could reasonably be considered a unique hardship. (CC4) | | |