AGENDA #:

#### **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION**

4-1-25

MEETING DATE:
TYPE OF REVIEW: FINAL COURTESY X CASE #
PROJECT INFORMATION
PROJECT NAME: Crescent Ridge S/D
PROJECT ADDRESS: #13175 Hopewell Road, Milton, Georgia 30004 (Parcel I.D. 22 495010370209)
OVERLAY/FORM BASED CODE: Rural Milton
HAS LDP/BUILDING PERMIT BEEN SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW? YES $\underline{X}$ NO
PROJECT TYPE (CHECK ONE): SITE/LANDSCAPE  BUILDING  SALES TRAILER  DEMOLITION  ZONING/USE PERMIT/VARIANCE _X  OTHER (EXPLAIN)  Variance request:  PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 1 4.4.4.(A) Reduce 50' front setback to 35 feet  2 4.4.4.(D) Increase 35' rear setback to 50 feet  3 4.4.3.(A) Reduce 100' lot width requirement for three cul-de-sac lots.
4 8.8.19(2)(b)(ii) Increase pool setback from 10 feet to 20 feet on rear property lin  APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION  CONTACT PERSON NAME: Scott D. Reece
COMPANY: Brumbelow-Reese & Associates, Inc.
ADDRESS: 13685 Highway 9, Milton, Georgia 30004
PHONE:770-475-6817FAX:770-569-4948
EMAIL: office@brumbelow-reese.com
APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE: To the best of my knowledge, this application is correct and complete. I understand that I, or my representative should be in attendance at the Design Review Board meeting on, at 6:00pm, to present this project. To best of my knowledge, I have met all applicable Overlay/Form Based Code conditions (H9/Deerfield, Birmingham, Crabapple, Rural Milton.)  Applicant:
2006 Heritage Walk Milton, GA 30004 P: 678.242.2500   F: 678.242.2499 info@cityofmiltonga.us   www.cityofmiltonga.u













# VARIANCE COURTESY REVIEW (6C)

Applicant: Scott D. Reece

Address: 13175 Hopewell Road

Total Area: 9.05 acres





# VARIANCE COURTESY REVIEW (6C)

### Variance Requests:

**Sec. 4.4.4.A. – Unified Development Code.** To reduce the 50 feet minimum front yard to 35 feet for eleven (11) total lots for the proposed Crescent Ridge Subdivision.

**Sec. 4.4.3.A. – Unified Development Code.** To reduce the 100 feet minimum lot width to 88.98 feet for lot 5 of the proposed Crescent Ridge Subdivision.

**Sec. 4.4.3.A. – Unified Development Code.** To reduce the 100 feet minimum lot width to 85.44 feet for lot 6 of the proposed Crescent Ridge Subdivision.

**Sec. 4.4.3.A. – Unified Development Code**. To reduce the 100 feet minimum lot width to 93.19 feet for lot 7 of the proposed Crescent Ridge Subdivision.





### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Setback increases for eleven (11) total lots for the proposed Crescent Ridge Subdivision:

- 1. Increase the 35 feet minimum rear yard to 50 feet.
- 2. Increase the rear 10 feet minimum pool, pool equipment and pool decking distance to 20 feet.









Subject Site

Parcels

City Limits





City of Milton

0.02 0.04 0

80.0

0.12

0.16 ■Miles

#### BRUMBELOW-REESE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Land Surveyors, Land Planners, Development Consultants 13685 Highway 9 N Milton, Georgia 30004 Phone 770-475-6817 Fax 770-569-4948

Email: office@Brumbelow-Reese.com

March 19, 2025

Michael Cardamon City of Milton 2006 Heritage Walk Milton, GA 30004

Re: Crescent Ridge Subdivision Variance Application

Dear Mr. Cardamon:

We are working with Fuqua and Associates in the development of Crescent Ridge Subdivision located at 13175 Hopewell Road. The property is 9.04 acres, zoned R-3 conditional. The Subdivision is 11 lots with the following Building Setback Lines: 50' front, 10' side, 35' rear. While developing the subdivision and clearing the property, we conferred with adjoining property owners about the relatively small area for rear yards and lack of privacy. When preparing the preliminary site plans with proposed residences, it became apparent that the area of disturbance was extending deep into each lot. We have searched for a solution that would best remedy the problem and have decided to petition for a reversal of the front and rear building lines. The subdivision is private with a gated entrance, so reducing the front building setback should not cause any detriment to the future residences or the surrounding properties. Whether the house is placed 45 feet behind the back of curb or 60 feet, the front yard will be totally graded. Increasing the rear setback from 35 feet to 50 feet will provide multiple advantages: possible preservation of existing natural vegetation along the rear property line, reduction of impervious area, increased separation of housing, and added privacy. With these thoughts in mind, the applicant is seeking variances to the UDC, specifically Section 4.4.4. (A),(D) and 4.4.3.(A). The applicant proposes to reduce the front setback from 50 feet to 35 feet, increase the rear setback from 35 feet to 50 feet, and reduce lot width from 100 feet on the 3 cul-de-sac lots. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to increase the pool setback from 10 feet to 20 feet on the rear property line of the lots (8.8.19.(b) (ii)). Fuqua and Associates wishes to provide the best possible product and impact the surrounding properties in the least possible manner. We feel granting these variances is the best solution.

The applicant has an approved Preliminary/Rezoning Plat that designates 11 lots, and the proposed variances do not increase the density or area of disturbance. Approval of the variances would not offend the spirit of the Ordinances. The property has steep topography and a stream running south to north on the eastern third of the property. The Preliminary Plat designates 3 acres as common area with 2 acres being untouched. The unique characteristics of the property

limit design options. The proposed variances would allow for larger rear yards and added privacy to adjoining properties. We have found that at least 13 subdivisions (over 500 lots) have been developed in Milton under the former CUP regulations. The CUP ordinance allowed for a 30' front setback. Current Milton UDC regulations allow for reduced cul-de-sac widths in other zonings. We feel the proposed variances would allow the development of a product no different than many other developed subdivisions. It is our opinion based on the previously stated facts, that relief, if granted, would not cause a substantial detriment to the public good and surrounding properties. Furthermore, the approval of these variances would not harm the public safety, health or welfare, and that substantial justice is done.

The applicant is seeking to provide the best product for his subdivision and the surrounding properties. There is no increase in density or any negative impact on the surrounding area or the city as a whole. Building the houses closer to the street in a gated community and increasing the rear setback just makes sense. The approval of these variances would be a win-win for all involved.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Reece

