# **ZONING & ANNEXATION SUMMARY**

# Petition Number(s): AZ21-01

## **APPLICANT INFORMATION AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION**

- Applicant: Lewis and Sanya Hauck
- **Representative:** Chad Hullander
- Location: <u>24 Royal Lake Cove</u>
- Total Acreage:3.108 acres

### LAND USE INFORMATION

- Current Zoning: County R-1 (Residential)
- Proposed Zoning: R-20 (Residential)
- Proposed Use: <u>Residential</u>

**Current Zoning of Adjacent Property:** 

North:	City R-20 (Residential) and County R-1 (Residential)
South:	County R-1 (Residential)
East:	County R-1 (Residential)
West:	County A-1 and R-1 (Residential)

## For All Tracts:

District: 4<sup>th</sup> Section: 3<sup>rd</sup> LL(S): 1140-1141

The Future Development Plan designates the subject property as: <u>Neo-traditional Residential</u> <u>nearest city properties</u>)

The Future Land Use Map designates adjacent or nearby city properties as: Low Density Residential (current County future land use map category)

# ANALYSIS

## **City Departments Reviews**

Electric: Takes no exception.

Fibercom: Takes no exception.

**Fire:** Cartersville Fire Department has the following concern for the annexation: A fire flow of the closest fire hydrant cannot be confirmed. CFD does not have records of the closest fire hydrant since it is a BCWD facility. I contacted BCFD to see if they have any records for the area and they did not. BCFD contacted BCWD to see if they had any records and they did not.

A flow test will be needed to confirm how much firefighting water is available before comments can be issued from Cartersville Fire Department. Cartersville Development Regulations Section 7.5-123 (2) (b) 5. States that a minimum water demand of 1000 GPM for 30 minutes at a minimum residual of 20 PSI is available for firefighting purposes.

Gas: Takes no exception.

**Public Works:** Public Works concurs with Mr. Olson's concern regarding the idea of providing city services to distant locations such the as the areas shown in annexation cases AZ21-01 and AZ21-02. Along with the public safety and school bus concern, there is a burden to supply solid waste services to these addresses, which are not close to other city customers. Our solid waste trucks would have to travel the routes described by Mr. Olson, one of which is still a private street. Service to just a few isolated customers such as this provides a strain to solid waste truck routes, timing, and additional wear and tear on vehicles.

In addition to the concern of city services being provided to the area, it should be noted that there is local floodplain on some of the properties in case AZ21-02. Therefore, our floodplain inventory will increase and will need to be updated to reflect this additional floodplain with our CRS (Community Rating System). Also, once annexed, all residential addresses would incur a monthly stormwater utility fee.

**Water and Sewer:** This property is located in the Bartow County Water Department's water service area. Contact the Bartow County Water Department for comments regarding water service to the property involved in this annexation request. Sewer service to this property is provided by septic tank.

**Cartersville School District:** After driving this area with our Director of Facilities, Maintenance, and Safety (who oversees Transportation), our concern is twofold: a) transportation and b) the continuation of requests. Currently, our bus that picks up in the Carter Grove subdivision turns around in the residential area of that subdivision. We do not drive down Summit Ridge Drive towards Highway 61 nor do we service that far down on Highway 61 (where Summit Ridge Drive connects with Highway 61). Also, will other properties begin to ask for annexation after this? If so, that is a concern for us because of the capacity issues at our schools. We are working on addressing these capacity issues at our schools, but we are still looking at approximately 2 years before the answer to these issues is completed.

#### Public Comments: None. As of 2-2-21.

**Bartow County Comments**: Plotting these annexations out on the map leads to a couple of concerns (see attached). First, Mr. and Ms. Hauck don't seem to be annexing their other property at 22 Royal Lake Cove and that basically leaves pretty much an unincorporated island. The driveway to the home they want to annex at 24 Royal Lake Cove doesn't appear to follow the property but crosses right through 22. That seems a public safety nightmare.

That's the other concern. This little pod of city will only be accessible with a long drive out Old Alabama and south on Hwy 61, or else coming through Carter Grove and the golf course. The City really want to start providing police service and school bus service way out here? It doesn't seem logical or coherent to start piecemeal annexing property out here. Once these go in, several of the homes on Royal Lake Drive would be contiguous and then we could start getting a gap-toothed neighborhood down here, with some in and some out of the city. I would think it would make more sense for the city to tell folks that they need to persuade the whole neighborhood (or at least use the 60% method to take the whole neighborhood). When I say "gap-toothed" I mean areas like Magnolia Drive or the Jones Mill/Grassdale Road neighborhoods. I would think we would want to get away from more of this.

#### **REQUEST SUMMARY:**

The applicant is requesting to be annexed into the City limits of Cartersville. This application is in association with annexation application AZ21-02 for properties located at 16,18 and 20 Royal Lake Cove.

There are nine lots on Royal Lake Cove. Seven of nine lots are developed with single family homes. Two lots are owned by the applicant. All lots are currently in unincorporated Bartow County. County water and Greystone Power currently serve the property.

#### STANDARDS FOR EXERCISE OF ZONING POWERS.

A. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property.

The zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property

B. Whether the zoning proposal will create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.

The zoning proposal will create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts because of access to the area for sanitation, stormwater maintenance, emergency services and school bus transportation, if requested.

# C. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.

The zoning proposal will not adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.

D. Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

The property affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

E. Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

The zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

# F. Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the adopted local Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The zoning proposal is in conformity with the adopted local Comprehensive Land Use *Plan for both City and County land uses.* 

G. Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could adversely affect the environment, including but not limited to drainage, wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, endangered wildlife habitats, soil erosion and sedimentation, floodplain, air quality, and water quality and quantity.

The zoning proposal will not result in a use which will or could adversely affect the environment.

H. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal.

*If approved, several city and county departments will be negatively impacted including sanitation, stormwater maintenance, emergency services and the school district.* 

**<u>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</u>** Staff recommends denial of this annexation based on the review comments from city and county departments.

## PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:





Parcel ID0074A-0002-040Sec/Twp/Rngn/aProperty Address24 ROYAL LAKE COVE

Alternate ID 19212 Class Residential Acreage n/a Owner Address HAUCK LEWIS & HAUCK SANYA M 24 ROYAL LAKE COVE SE CARTERSVILLE, GA 30120





 Parcel ID
 0074A-0002-040

 Sec/Twp/Rng
 n/a

 Property Address
 24 ROYAL LAKE COVE

Alternate ID 19212 Class Residential Acreage n/a Owner Address HAUCK LEWIS & HAUCK SANYA M 24 ROYAL LAKE COVE SE CARTERSVILLE, GA 30120



12/26/2017 - 01/25/2018





Application for Annexation/ Zoning City of Cartersville

Case Numbe	r: <u>A</u>	Z	2	- i	01
Date Received:	2-7	28	- 2	502	Ő

Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission $\frac{2/9}{5:30 \text{ pm}}$ 1st City Council $\frac{2/18/21}{7:00 \text{ pm}}$ 2nd City Council $\frac{3/4/21}{7:00 \text{ pm}}$
5:30pm 7:00pm 7:00pm
Applicant     Grinted name)     Office Phone       Address     24 Rays (LAK: Cove SE     Mobile/ Other Phone
Address 24 Ray LAKE COVE SE Mobile/ Other Phone
city Corters ville State GA Zip 30/20 Email hauckserv Keince ad 200
Representative's printed name (if other than applicant) Phone (Rep)
Aug Email (Rep)
Representative Signature
Signed, sealed and delivered in presence of: Stammark 1125/23
Notary Public
COUNTY COUNTY
Lewis Hauck 294 3207 * Titleholder's printed name) 24 Payo (Little Coversion)
Address Contraction Email houck Service in Le gol. com
Signature Car Haut IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
Signed, sealed, delivered in presence of: Y = R = 0 With SSION 4 My commission expires: $(-4 - 22)$
Notary Public AR AUGUST
2 VAL STORE OF
CUNTY GUNTY
Present Zoning District County Requested Zoning City Limits
Acreage 3,108 Land Lot(s) 1140 + 114 District(s) Section(s)
Location of Property: 24 PoyAl Alecove SE Contersville (sa 30/20 (street address, nearest intersections, etc.)
Reason for Rezoning Request:
(attach additional statement as necessary)

\* Attach additional notarized signatures as needed on separate application pages.

City of Cartersville \* Planning and Development Department \* 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor \* 10 N. Public Square Cartersville, GA 30120 \* 770-387-5600 \* www.cityofcartersville.org

# Zoning Analysis for Annexation/ Zoning

Specifics of Proposed Use

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Tax Map Parcel(s) #_00744 0002 - 040	Voting Ward(s)
Current Land Use Residential C Proposed Land Use Residential P	urrent Zoning <u>Residential</u>
Number of Dwelling Units	Number of Occupants
Owner Occupied? Yes No Number of School-aged Children G	ade Level(s) of School-aged Children
School(s) to be attended:	
<u>Current</u> Utility Service Provider	s (Check Service provider or list if Other)
Water:CityCounty	Well/ Other
Sewer: City County	Septic/ Other
Natural Gas: City Other (List	1 Propane
Electricity: City GA Power	Greystone
Other (List	

a

K:\Planning General Info\City Forms\_apps\_mailing labels\Forms and Applications\Annexation Rezoning Special Use Variance apps\Annexation\_Rezoning application\_updated 12-6-19.doc 2

### CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE REPORT FOR REZONING ACTIONS

Pursuant to O.C.G.A. 36-67A-3 any and all applicants to a rezoning action must make the following disclosures:

Date of Application:	Decemb	Der	203	0
Date Two Years Prior				
Date Five Years Prior	to Application: _	Dece	mber	2015

Has the applicant within the five (5) years preceding the filing of the rezoning action made 1. campaign contributions aggregating \$250.00 or more to any of the following:

	YES	NO
Mayor: Matt Santini		<u>X</u>
Council Member:		1
Ward 1- Kari Hodge		
Ward 2- Jayce Stepp		<u> </u>
Ward 3- Cary Roth		
Ward 4- Calvin Cooley		X
Ward 5- Gary Fox		<u>×</u>
Ward 6- Taff Wren	())	<u>     X</u>
Planning Commission	ë.	
Greg Culverhouse	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_X
Harrison Dean		_×_
Lamar Pendley		<u>_X</u>
Lamar Pinson		<u> </u>
Travis Popham		X
Jeffery Ross		_ <u> </u>
Stephen Smith		_X

If the answer to any of the above is Yes, please indicate below to whom, the dollar 2. amount, date, and description of each campaign contribution, during the past five (5) years.

Signature Leetis Houck Date

**Print Name** 

K:\Planning General Info\City Forms\_apps\_mailing labels\Forms and Applications\Annexation Rezoning Special Use Variance apps\Annexation\_Rezoning application\_updated 12-6-19.doc

#### LIST OF ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS (Not required if City mails public notices)

The following are all of the individuals, firms, or corporations owning property on the sides, rear, and in front of (across street from) the property sought to be rezoned:

	NAME	ADDRESS	
1.	Ched Hullorder	16 Royal Lake Que SE Catorsille Ge 30171	0
2.	Berbore MARTIN		
3.	Joel Bruce		
4.	DAVIE BINGeme	on 17 RoyalLake Covess In 11	
5.	Ron Barker	15 in the the the the the	
6.	Dillense Holding L	P Old AlabamaRd Cartossille.	
7.	Leslie Brind	24 Payal Lake De. CortosvilaCon	
8.	Dornell JACKSON	23 PoyAl LAKE DR 11 11	
9.	FRED + Dirr Punde		
10.	Thielen Generats	78 Christon DR 11 /1	
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.		6	
15.			

Attach additional names if necessary.

(Indicate property owned by the above persons on plat accompanying this application.)

K:\Planning General Info\City Forms\_apps\_mailing labels\Forms and Applications\Annexation Rezoning Special Use Variance apps\Annexation\_Rezoning application\_updated 12-6-19.doc 9





#### SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

That the undersigned, a Georgia Registered Land Surveyor, on behalf of the above Annexation/ zoning applicant do certify the following:

- 1) That the attached survey contains no fewer than four surveyed map regulation points and recorded with the Georgia Coordinate System of 1985.
- 2) That the attached survey shows the boundaries of the area being annexed and the existing boundaries of the area being annexed and the existing boundaries of the annexing municipality between the points at which these boundaries close, if applicable.
- 3) That the attached survey meets the requirements of O.C.G.A. 15-6-67 and Section 180-7-01 Technical Standards for Property Survey, Rules and Regulations of the State of Georgia.
- 4) That the map demarcation of the map registration points are well distributed along, within, or near the boundary of the annexed area.
- 5) That at least one-eighth of the aggregate external boundary or fifty (50) feet of the area to be annexed, whichever is less, either abuts directly on the municipal boundary or would directly abut on the municipal boundary if it were not otherwise separated from the municipal boundary by other lands owned by the municipal corporation, by lands owned by this State, or by the definite width of any street or street right of way; any creek or river; any right of way of a railroad or other public service corporation, which divides the municipal boundary from any area proposed to be annexed.

Date

(Seal)

Georgia Registered Land Surveyor

#### **ZONING ADMINISTRATOR:**

- 1. Case Number: AZ21-01
- 2. Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

The above property complies with the City of Cartersville minimum size requirements to construct a building or structure occupiable by persons or property under the policies, ordinance, or regulations of the City of Cartersville.

3. Survey attached?

2-1-21 (Included with application)

David Hardegree

Date

Zoning Administrator

K:Planning General Info/City Forms\_apps\_mailing labels/Forms and Applications/Annexation Rezoning Special Use Variance apps/Annexation\_Rezoning application\_updated 12-6-19.doc 6

