

From: "Harrison, Greg X" <Greg.X.Harrison@delta.com>

Date: July 29, 2020 at 5:37:13 PM EDT

To: Kelly Axt <kaxt@CityOfPowderSprings.org>

Subject: Request to speak to Mayor and Council regarding Lost Lakes Variance

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Powder Springs network. Maintain caution when opening external links/attachments

Please include my updated Objection letter and picture in tonight's Meeting Agenda (my previously submitted letter may be omitted).

Thank you,
GH

My neighbor is making an impassioned plea to construct a secondary driveway on her property based on her aging parents' mobility issues. Her application states that her parents will require "stepless entry into the home." For that reason she is requesting a variance to construct a secondary parking pad between our homes in order to more easily access her basement. Emily made an emotional plea to our Lost Mountain Lakes HOA sighting 'Reasonable Accommodation' under the American's with Disabilities Act. I have no doubt the applicant's use of this legal standard played a significant role in the HOA board's decision to approve Emily's request. That was reinforced when an HOA Board member joined Tuesday's Council Meeting to voice her support for the parking pad variance to assist in Emily's stated goal of providing for her parents well-being. I have raised my objections to my HOA, and requested an audience, yet the board has chosen not to respond to me. I am not a heartless human-being, but the issue to be determined is not whether or not we should provide for our aging parents' well-being. The issue is, is this proposed parking pad in keeping with the architectural, landscape, and aesthetic of the surrounding community and/or does it impose unnecessarily on the surrounding properties. I am here to suggest the proposed parking pad does not meet any of those standards and does unnecessarily impose upon a neighboring property.

First, the ADA **does not cover strictly residential private apartments and homes**. Since the law does not apply, the request is without legal grounds and could be rejected, as such. Second, the parking pad will not eliminate the applicant's parents need to navigate a full flight of stairs, inside the home, to get from the basement to the main floor where the kitchen is located. Based on the applicants statement, "the driveway won't get a lot of use" as far as coming and going activity is concerned, the stairway to the kitchen will have to be conquered far more often than coming and going through the basement door. If the flight of stairs inside the house can be overcome on a daily basis to eat, then navigating that same stairway to come and go external to the home should not be a challenge. For this reason, the request is without merit, as it does not eliminate her parents' need to navigate stairs in their primary residence on a daily basis. If accommodations have been made to get her parents up and down the internal stairwell, then this secondary driveway is not necessary. My point ultimately being, this secondary parking pad does not have to exist in order for Emily to get to her stated goal of providing for her aging parents' well-being.

My community/neighborhood does not allow for my garbage can to be in a clear line of sight from the street, yet sees no problem with this proposal that will result in a parking pad and parked car visible to all passersby? The proposed parking pad will not terminate out of any line of sight from my property, whether sitting on my front porch or back patio. The homes in question (2751 and 2753) are situated on a curve and are therefore not parallel in their orientation to one another. The homes were intentionally built with driveways on opposite sides to create a large expanse of green space (architecture, landscape, and aesthetic), and avoid bringing a driveway into the narrow space (13 ft. back corner of my dwelling to back corner of hers) between the back corners of the two homes.

Following a thorough walkthrough of my neighborhood, I identified three (3) homes with secondary driveways not terminating in a garage/overhead door (the other homes mentioned with secondary driveways all terminate in garages/overhead doors). Two (2) of the three (3) homes have no naturally occurring neighbor on the side of the secondary driveway, as they are at the back entrance to the neighborhood. Of these, one does have an out building with an overhead door, at least giving the appearance of a detached garage in which a vehicle could be parked. The only other secondary driveway without an overhead door, is situated between two homes on full basements, situated parallel to one another and the drive terminates out of the line of sight of either front door. The proposed secondary parking pad will have a significantly different impact to the architecture, landscaping, and aesthetic than those already in existence within the community/neighborhood.

I suggest. the proposed parking pad will result in additional water runoff from the applicant's property onto mine. Emily has countered this with a letter from a Civil Engineer. That letter states that water moves more efficiently across concrete than it does grass. It does not address that my property is at a lower point than the applicant's and will therefore be the recipient of this more efficiently displaced water. Common sense tells you that you cannot lay 600 square feet of concrete and not have an impact on the surrounding area. I find the response dismissive and ultimately placing the burden on me to deal with the additional water runoff.

The proposed parking pad will run right through the center of the existing greenspace intentionally created when the homes were built. The impact of approving the variance should not impose unnecessarily on the surrounding properties. I am here to suggest that all of the potential negative impacts will be to my property and its value. There is no negative impact, real or imagined, to the applicant. I will be left to deal with the excess water and landscaping costs to try hide the eyesore from view.

In closing, allowing for this parking pad is not in keeping with the preservation of architectural integrity, landscaping continuity, or aesthetic beauty. The parking pad will break up the greenspace, thus significantly altering the landscaping and aesthetic beauty. These outcomes cannot help but negatively impact my property's value. For each of the previously stated reasons, I ask the Mayor and City Council to reject the requested variance. I sincerely appreciate your time and attention to this matter.

Thank you,
Greg Harrison

