

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS ⁰⁰⁵

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
R1	RH1	U1
R-2	RH2	U1
R - 2A	RH3	U1
R - 2B	RH4	U1
R-3	RH5/CR1	U1
R-3A	RH6	U1
R-4	RN1/CR2 ⁰⁰⁴	U2
R-4A	RN2	U2
R-4B	RN4	U1
R5 ⁰⁰¹ ⁰⁰²	RN5	U4 ⁰⁰⁷
Fulton R-3	RH5	U1
RG-1	RN9	U6
RG-2	RX3	U6
RG-3	RX5 ⁰⁰³	⁰⁰⁶
RG-4	RX8	U7
RG-5	RX15	U8
RG-6	RX25	U8
R-LC	RX3	U8

#001

Posted by **Kelly in Edgewood** on **07/02/2024** at **4:12pm** [Comment ID: 207] - [Link](#)
Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

R5-C is missing from this chart. What will the new zoning be for R5-C?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **07/03/2024** at **12:12pm** [Comment ID: 241] - [Link](#)
Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

R5-C is not a zoning district. The properties are zoned R5 and have additional restrictions imposed via conditions (-C). The zoning map shows properties with conditions by adding a "-C" to the end. Examples include MRC-3-C, RG-3-C, R5-C, etc.

#002

Posted by **Stephanie Salyer** on **07/10/2024** at **9:12am** [Comment ID: 443] - [Link](#)
Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

It will be important to make sure that any zoning with conditions are reflected here. And if more appropriate those zoning districts with conditions may need to be zoned differently than stated in this conversion to ensure it is clear to developers what the actual zoning stipulations are. For example R5C only allows 50% lot coverage and 55%FAR and ADUs are not allowed with zero lot line subdivisions. Currently the total number of units allowed per lot for R5 is two (primary plus 1 adu OR a duplex). This conversion states that there could be up to six units on an R5 lot which is not in alignment with the conditional zoning or current R5 zoning. It seems like the current R5C district aligns better with the RC2 rather than the proposed RN5. Additionally feasibility studies need to be shared that show how this proposed increase to density is not going to negatively impact tree coverage, watershed, and other outdated infrastructure that may not be able to support this level of density.

#003

Posted by **Jennifer Friese** on **06/01/2024** at **7:11am** [Comment ID: 59] - [Link](#)
Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This is not an apples to apples conversion. The new category would allow more physical density without adding people density. In order for Atlanta to remain the City in the Forest we need to be mindful about lot coverage, min lot size and transitional height planes.

#004

Posted by **Jennifer Friese** on **06/01/2024** at **7:03am** [Comment ID: 58] - [Link](#)
Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

What is CR2 and where can its metrics be found on the Form & Frontage Discussion Draft?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/01/2024** at **9:54am** [Comment ID: 79] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

These are found under 2.2.8 and 2.2.9. They are new districts based on R3 (CR1) and R4 (CR2) that will limit building height to the height of surrounding uses.

These districts would be available for areas zoned R3 and R4 today that want to preserve the low-rise (often "ranch house") scale of the neighborhood, without having to become a historic district to accomplish this.

Reply by **Jennifer Frieze** on **06/01/2024** at **12:02pm** [Comment ID: 81] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Thank you

#005

Posted by **Patrick Ford** on **06/10/2024** at **1:30pm** [Comment ID: 123] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Where does the existing PD-H zoning designation go in Zoning 2.0. I cannot find it here

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/11/2024** at **9:20am** [Comment ID: 124] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

As currently envisioned, PD-H would be eliminated. All properties zoned PD-H would be converted to new Form & Frontage and Use Districts. Site-specific conditions, such as an approved site plan, would be readopted as part of adopting the New Zoning Ordinance. No future PD-H zoning applications would be allowed.

#006

Posted by **Jennifer Frieze** on **06/01/2024** at **7:45am** [Comment ID: 78] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This USE category does not reflect the current standards in RG3 districts - RG3 should be in USE category U6 for an apples to apples conversion.

#007

Posted by **tadbook** on **07/03/2024** at **7:55am** [Comment ID: 219] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Do I understand correctly that this changes the zoning for R5 from 2 units to 6 units per lot? (2 main + 4 accessory)? That sounds like a huge increase in density.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **07/03/2024** at **12:13pm** [Comment ID: 242] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

As you note, the current code limits the number of ADUs and primary residences, but it also allows a property owner to 1) split the two primary units into two lots using zero lot line subdivision and each resulting lot is allowed one ADU, then 2) add "guest houses" to each new lot (only restricted by a limit of 30% of the floor area of the primary unit. Will explain what is currently allowed at the July 9th meeting. We hope you can join us. Register here:

https://us06web.zoom.us/join/9tZUkf-CurTorGdKCgRHV5DS_gCQdvSKfKfwz#/registration

Reply by **dpsmiami** on **07/09/2024** at **7:09pm** [Comment ID: 398] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I did not hear this addressed at July 9 meeting (might have missed it) and asked it in a question at 7:26 pm but it was skipped over. So would the transition from R-5 to U4 retain the lot split required to achieve the 6 units or just allow it by right? Aren't there limits on lot splitting that serve to constrain the creation of 6 units in R-5 lots, i.e. not every R-5 lot can be split? And so if you allowed 6 units without a lot split then this would effectively allow a much easier route to the 6 units?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **07/10/2024** at **8:59am** [Comment ID: 442] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I believe you are referring to "zero lot line" subdivision, where a side-by-side duplex can be split into two separate lots by-right. This would still be allowed in R5-equivalent under the proposed draft. However, the accessory unit could NOT be split to have its own lot.

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
O-I	CM	U46
MR-1	RN9	U6
MR-2	RX3	U6
MR-3	RX8	U7
MR-4A	RX8	U7
MR-4B	RX5	U7
MR-5A	RX15	U8
MR-5B	RX15	U8
MR-6	RX25	U8
MR-MU	RN9	U6
MRC - 1	MX5 (local streets) or MS5 (nonlocal streets)	U31
MRC - 2	MX15 (local streets) or MS15 (nonlocal streets)	U31
MRC - 3	MX25 (local streets) or MS25 (nonlocal streets)	U31
NC General	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U11
NC-2	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U12
NC-3	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U11

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
NC-4	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U11
NC-5	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U11
NC-6	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U13
NC-7	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U14
NC-8	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U15
NC-10	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U15
NC-11	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U11
NC-12	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U15
NC-13	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U15
NC-14	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U13
NC-15	MS2/MS3 (based on the number of stories)	U13
C1	MX5 (local streets) or MS5 (nonlocal streets)	U31
C2	MX15 (local streets) or MS15 (nonlocal streets)	U31
C3	MX25 (local streets) or MS25 (nonlocal streets)	U31

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
C4	MC1	U37
C5	MC2	U37
I-1	I1	U43
I-2	I2	U44
I-MIX	IX15	U40
LW	MX3	U38
SPI-1 SA1	MC4	U37
SPI-1 SA2	MC3	U37
SPI-1 SA3	MC2	U37
SPI-1 SA4	MC1	U37
SPI-1 SA5	MC3	U37
SPI-1 SA6	MC4	U37
SPI-1 SA7	MC4	U37
SPI-2 SA1	S-FM	n/a
SPI-2 SA2	S-FM	n/a
SPI-2 SA3	S-FM	n/a
SPI-2 SA4	S-FM	n/a
SPI-2 SA5	S-FM	n/a

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-3 SA 1	RN4	U2
SPI-3 SA 2	RN7	U5
SPI-3 SA 3	RN9	U10
SPI-3 SA 4	MX3	U27
SPI-3 SA 5	MX5	U27/U28
SPI-3 SA 6	MX8	U31
SPI-3 SA 7		U31
SPI-3 SA 8	IX5	U41
SPI-3 SA 9	MX5/MX10/MX15 (based on max. height)	U31
SPI-4 SA1		U2/U4
SPI-4 SA2	RX3	U8
SPI-4 SA3	RN3 (Single-unit)/RN6 (two-unit)	U18
SPI-4 SA4	MX5	U21
SPI-4 SA5	MX8	U6
SPI-4 SA6	RX5	U6
SPI-4 SA7	MX3	
SPI-4 SA8	IX5	U41

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-4 SA9	RN9	U6
SPI-4 SA10	MX10	U25
SPI-4 SA11	RX3	U6
SPI-4 SA12	CM	U16
SPI-4 SA13	MX10/MX25 (based on max. height)	U25
SPI-5 - SA1	PK	U45
SPI-5 - SA2	RN5	U4
SPI-5 - SA3	RN5	U4
SPI-6 - SA1	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA2	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA3	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA4	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-7 - SA1	PK	U45
SPI-7- SA2A	RN2	U2
SPI-7- SA2B	RN2	U2
SPI-7- SA2C	RN2	U2
SPI-7- SA3	RN5	U4

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-8	n/a	n/a
SPI-9 - SA1	S-BV	n/a
SPI-9 - SA2	S-BV	n/a
SPI-9 - SA3	S-BV	n/a
SPI-9 - SA4	S-BV	n/a
SPI-11-SA1	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA2	MX5	U21
SPI-11-SA3	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA4	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA5	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA6	RN3	U1
SPI-11-SA7	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA8	RX3	U8
SPI-11-SA9	MX3	U23
SPI-11-SA10	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA11	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-11-SA12	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-12 - SA1	S-BV	n/a

#008

Posted by **Patrick Ford** on **06/05/2024** at **11:02am** [Comment ID: 109] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

By my understanding of the Zoning 2.0 process, no changes are being made to the SPI-9 code and its subareas, correct so the Proposed Form and Frontage district S-BV is essentially a renaming of SPI-9, correct?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/05/2024** at **4:25pm** [Comment ID: 116] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Correct. The Buckhead Village SPI is very site-specific.

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-12 - SA2	S-010	n/a
SPI-12 - SA3	S-BS	n/a
SPI-12 - SA4	S-BS	n/a
SPI-14	n/a	n/a
SPI-15-SA1	IX5	U39
SPI-15-SA2	RN6/MX15	U33
SPI-15-SA3	RN6/MX25	U33
SPI-15-SA4	MX25	U33
SPI-15-SA5	RX15	U8
SPI-15-SA6	RX3	U8
SPI-15-SA7	RX5	U8
SPI-15-SA8	RX8	U7/U8
SPI-15-SA9	MX25	U33
SPI-16-SA1	009-M	U34
SPI-16-SA2	S-M	U35
SPI-16-SA3	S-M	U36
SPI-17-SA1	RN10/PK	U6/U45
SPI-17-SA2	RN2/RN11	U9

#009

Posted by **Jennifer Frieese** on **06/05/2024** at **12:17pm** [Comment ID: 113] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Where can we find metrics for S-M districts? I did not see them in Form & Frontage Discussion Draft. Does S-M stand for Small-Medium?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/05/2024** at **4:18pm** [Comment ID: 114] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

S-M means "Special District - Midtown." Special Districts are currently proposed to be incorporated into the new Zoning Ordinance relatively unchanged due to their complexity and/or specificity. As a result, we have not copied the text over. You can review the existing SPI 16 Subarea 1 (Midtown) text here:

https://library.municode.com/ga/atlanta/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOOORANDECO_PT16ZO_CH16-18PSPMISPPUINDIRE

#010

Posted by **Patrick Ford** on **06/05/2024** at **11:03am** [Comment ID: 110] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

By my understanding of the Zoning 2.0 process, no changes are being made to the SPI-12 code and its subareas, correct so the Proposed Form and Frontage district S-BS is essentially a renaming, correct?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/05/2024** at **4:23pm** [Comment ID: 115] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Correct. The Buckhead/Lenox SPI is site-specific, with special maps, etc. At this time we do not plan to convert it to the new format.

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-17-SA3	RN5/RN9/RN10 (east of Piedmont)/RN11 (west of Piedmont)	U20
SPI-17-SA4	RN10	U6
SPI-18-SA1	MX5	U32
SPI-18-SA2	MX10	U32
SPI-18-SA3	MX10	U11
SPI-18-SA4	RX5	U6
SPI-18-SA5	RN4	U2
SPI-18-SA6	RN7	U4
SPI-18-SA7	I1	U41
SPI-18-SA8	I2	U42
SPI-18-SA9	MX3	U38
SPI-18-SA10	MX5	U8
SPI-19-SA1	MX5	U22
SPI-19-SA2	MX5	U22
SPI-19-SA3	CM	U16
SPI-19-SA4	MX10	U26
SPI-19-SA5	RX5	U6

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-19-SA6	RN4	U2
SPI-19-SA7	RX5	U8/U19
SPI-19-SA8	MX5	U26
SPI-19-SA9	MX3	U26
SPI-19-SA10	MX3	U26
SPI-19-SA11	MX5	U26
SPI-20-SA1	S-G	U29
SPI-20-SA2	S-G	U24
SPI-20-SA3	S-G	U24
SPI-20-SA4	S-G	U17
SPI-20-SA5	S-G	U8
SPI-20-SA6	S-G	U1
SPI-21-SA1	MX15	U32
SPI-21-SA2	MX8	U32
SPI-21-SA3	MX3	U11
SPI-21-SA4	MX3	U32
SPI-21-SA5	RX8	U8
SPI-21-SA6	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)

CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM & FRONTAGE DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-21-SA7	RN3	U2
SPI-21-SA8	CM	U11
SPI-21-SA9	MX8	U41
SPI-21-SA10	MX25	U41
SPI-22-SA1	MX25	U30
SPI-22-SA2	MX5	U30
SPI-22-SA3	MX8	U30
SPI-22-SA4	MX8	U30
SPI-22-SA5	PK	U45
SPI-24	RN1	n/a
SPI-25	RH2	n/a