SANDY SPRINGS
GEORGIA

Planning Commission
June 7, 2007

Special Call Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present	Susan D. Maizar, Don Boyken (Vice Chair), Bob Wiley, Wayne Thatcher and Lee Duncan
Board Members Absent Excused	Roger Rupnow (Chair), and David Rubenstein
Staff Present	Michael Zehner, Nancy Leathers, Vann McNeil, Cesar Geraldo, Patrice Ruffin, Mark Moore and Jon Drisdale

CALL to Order	Bob Wiley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

I. ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS

A. A Resolution to authorize the transmittal of the Comprehensive Plan Draft Community Agenda to the Atlanta Regional Commission and Georgia Department of Community Affairs to meet State Planning Requirements 110-12-01 for the purposes of obtaining qualified local government status of the City of Sandy Springs.

Bob Wiley: This is a special call meeting of the Sandy Springs Planning Commission for this explicit purpose of allowing the members to ask questions of the staff to clarify points in the plan presented to us. At this meeting there will be no public comment and we open it up and allow the members of the commission to ask questions of other members of the commission or the staff. At the end of the meeting we will vote on the comprehensive plan.

What we will being doing is having a general discussion, clarify the points and at the end when it comes to the vote time, any changes that we feel that need to be made we will make amendments to that and vote on those amendments.

Lee Duncan: The first comment and it references pages 37 through 39 and I know that there are going to be specific comments from Susan on some of these so I am going to defer to her on this but my reaction anytime we are putting together a Comprehensive Land Use Plan and we are moving from a residential 2 to 3, to a residential 0 to1 as an example is moratically impacting in my opinion property values and I really would like to make sure that everybody that is involved with a change in that direction is totally notified and is given the chance to be involved in this process. I have noticed here just going through those 12 situations where that occurs here that is probably half of the different nodes that we are looking at. My first comment is passing on to the City Council is we are affecting people's 401k's here. We are affecting their investments they have been making for their entire lives and I want to make sure they are fully aware of what we are doing.

Don Boyken: Lee may I ask a question of your statement? I am trying to understand if what it is changing from is what I understand to be in the original recommendation, to exchanging to be going to something different? Or is this what was in the Fulton County plan and we changing it to something different?

Bob Wiley: Let Nancy answer that and address that most of these are what is on the ground.

Nancy Leathers: In that table changing from means there is an existing adopted interim plan which is what the Council voted on last June which was an amendment to the Fulton County Plan that was adopted in 2005. That the change from is what is in the currently adopted plan to what the Committee is recommending on the right hand side of that table. It is not a change in zoning because in almost every case these properties were not zoned as they were shown on the plan but it is the change in plan designation.

Don Boyken: If I understand correctly while a property may have been in the land use plan at 3 units per acre it effectively had only one unit per acre we are now changing it back to where it currently exists at?

Nancy Leathers: In most cases that is what happened.

Lee Duncan: The concern that I have Don is that families of certain values, appraised properties based on expectations. When I pass away what is my son going to be inheriting on that particular piece of property and how has that been effective if it has been? It may not affect it and these people may not care and I don't know that. But I think that you are running a risk, this is going to be our guide for the next five years and you are running a risk of compromising values if we are not careful on how this particular issue is looked at.

Wayne Thatcher: In answering that I was on CAC and when these pieces came up what the staff basically told us was that we are changing it to what is physically on the ground in these subdivisions.

Don Boyken: I understand what Lee is talking about is if I got a piece of property it may not be zoned but in the land use plan it allows me a greater density. It does have a higher value to me for a later sale.

Susan Maizar: It is not guaranteed though.

Don Boyken: It is never guaranteed.

Lee Duncan: Even with the higher density you don't have the sale guarantee. You still have to go out and market it.

Don Boyken: I understand the concern and I think that it is good concern but as long as it is being changed back to what it currently exists and physically exists and there is nothing here that is (inaudible) something to be less dense than it currently is? I guess when we look at these in the future for future zonings, maybe we just need to come back and revisit these when somebody comes in and asked for a rezoning and a new variance and make a determination at that time.

Lee Duncan: That is my first observation as I read through this and that is first thing that came to mind as I was going through it. Jumping to policies page 95, I am confused and maybe Bob you can help me with this, what is quality housing in the range of housing size, cost and density that would be encouraged in the city housing opportunities district? What does that mean? Vann?

Vann McNeil: It means looking where there is an opportunity to have as Susan was talking about earlier to have a mixed of housing opportunities available for people in different prices ranges. The housing opportunities QCO, the Quality Community Objectives; the state has a list of guidelines that they call quality community objectives that they would like to see that are sort of larger objectives for the state as a whole. They would like to see local governments consider when they are going through this process creating a community agenda with policies that link to those state desired objectives so a quality community objective.

Lee Duncan: Is this particular sentence encouraging us to look at higher densities and lower prices on product? Is that what I am interpreting this to mean?

Nancy Leathers: It really is talking about having a range of opportunities.

Lee Duncan: Item #2, encourage a variety of home styles, densities and price ranges in locations that are accessible to jobs and services to ensure housing for individuals and families of all incomes and age groups. I totally support what I think that statement reads but I am not sure that I am interpreting that exactly the right way. Are we actually saying that we are encouraging a variety of housing styles or we regulating housing styles more importantly?

Nancy Leathers: No, we are just encouraging a variety.

Lee Duncan: By variety are you talking about looking at flats, condos, town homes?

Nancy Leathers: I think the intent of that is to make sure that there is a range of housing styles and types in the area that are available to meet the variety of needs that people have.

Lee Duncan: So this is introducing a level of flexibility in the mentality of Sandy Springs Planners?

Nancy Leathers: Yes.

Lee Duncan: That is a wonderful thing. The next item on rezoning, the new freestanding apartments is discouraged. I guess that we need to careful in my opinion Mr. Vice Chair, on something along these lines. I see where it states freestanding but I feel that we need to be in a position to offer housing to people from the very beginning of their career to the end of their career. Traditionally the very beginning of anybody's career is involved with some type of rental housing whether it be apartments or rental products and I don't know that we have too much apartments or not enough apartments but I know that by discouraging freestanding apartments we might be eliminating an element that might provide a new level of work force in Sandy Springs that we might desperately need.

Wayne Thatcher: What does it mean by freestanding .....

Nancy Leathers: That is what I wanted to respond to. What really is being discussed here is encouraging multi-family units to be in mixed use areas and that is where almost all the designations are for multi-family units. The goal is to try and get people living closer to work, to having things closer together so that we reduce traffic down and make things a more tied together than they currently are. That is the purpose of not just having a freestanding development separate and apart from everything else.

Lee Duncan: I know what the purpose is I am just concerned that we are putting a big negative here on a housing type that might be desirable at some point in time and I am concerned and I don't like to say no I would rather analyze a product as it comes along and the market is dictating and I think for the livelihood of Sandy Spring we need to be continually growing and we need to continue in the transition mode and in order to that we have to accommodate housing types for all kinds of people who are going to be living in Sandy Springs.

Bob Wiley: As you brought up before this is not a law this is a guideline and the guidelines can be updated as situations change.

Lee Duncan: I just felt as a policy statement I would like to put something in there that just says....

Bob Wiley: Lee one of the things if you remember that we had the biggest problem with Fulton County was their continuing approval of apartments in this area. Creating more of a ... I am of the opinion that a homeowner is more grounded in the community than an apartment dweller. An apartment dweller if they get upset with what is going on around them they move. The homeowner is going to sit there and fight for improvement in their community. One of the things where we had a problem with and I think it got to where we were 60% apartment units and 40% homes. We need to get that back in balance. I personally don't know why we have a target of balance here but that may be something legally that we can or cannot do. I think that is what this is talking about trying to get it back in balance.

Lee Duncan: I will be comfortable with a balance number. I would be more comfortable with that. I think that it gives some kind of direction here as opposed to just saying no.

Wayne Thatcher: We can make a recommendation to the City Council that they investigate what the actual percentage of apartments is to single family or other types of housing and to develop a policy number if it is appropriate.

Lee Duncan: Next page is 96. We have a series of comments here regarding lifecycles, continuing care, housing for seniors, disabled, etc., etc... The minimum housing size is for seniors. I really appreciate the City of Sandy Springs getting ready to take care of me in my next life but I think that a statement in here needs to be brought into play that states we are trying to develop programs to encourage singles, young married housing types to meet their requirements and styles of housing that would encourage them to come live in Sandy Springs and buy in Sandy Springs and raise their families in Sandy Springs and at the same time don't change this, just add to it is what I am trying to say.

Item #2 Policies regarding housing affordability comprehensive plan does not support the waiver of development impact fees for affordable housing. Why not?

Nancy Leathers: I believe that the committee felt that if impact fees were going to be imposed then everyone should pay equally on impact fees.

Don Boyken: Let's leave that one alone for just a second. Would you like to have some level of flexibility built into this policy that allowed staff to either provide incentives or bonuses?

Nancy Leathers: I would not encourage that to be a staff initiative. I think that the City Council needs to address those issues on whether they want to do those kinds of bonuses separate and apart. It may not be that the place to that is in the impact fee ordinance or it may be. But it exists with the expression of the committee.

Lee Duncan: I just would like if we are going to doing affordable housing, if we are going to be encouraging affordable housing I would like to be exploring options that truly encourage affordable housing and that is what this is trying to do. Policies regarding affordable housing and there needs to be a positive outlook I would think. We have got some very smart people in the city and I think we can create some very good incentives that would provide for those affordable initiatives to advance.

Item #3 Sandy Springs government should consider innovative programs that would help its own labor force including police officers, firefighters, other professionals such as teachers in the public and private school systems afford detached single family homes in the city. Item #3 and Item 2 in my opinion are in direct conflict with each other and Item #2 we are talking not supporting any waiver of development impact fees and Item #3 now we are making a statement here that says we want to encourage policies to get people in here. We have got to figure out a way to write this where the two of them blend in a little bit better. This is a contradictory statement here. In the city zoning and development ordinances provide for innovations and housing types and allow for deviations from land development improvement standards for projects that demonstrate consistency with affordable housing objectives. Give me examples of what that means please?

Michael Zehner: Basically the difference is housing types would be allowing flexibility or movement away from possibly town homes, strictly town home development or strictly apartment and condo development but (inaudible) development similar to what is going on with cliff now where they have a flat project that is in a building that resembles a town home and where we get that product that has aesthetic quality but also encourages smaller unit sizes that are more affordable possibly. Sort of the development regulations that is something that we recognized the other day and may have some inability to produce those standards.

Nancy Leathers: My suggestion is that is an issue for you. You may want to delete the words land and improvement and just indicate development standards as a general group of characteristics. It will give you a broader range of things that you can take a look at.

Don Boyken: I think that it is good approach I just want to make sure that Council recognizes there needs to some actions taken by them in order to implement this particular policy if it is going to be something that is realized in the very near future.

In order so we don't lose that recommendation Nancy should we just say that is amendment #1?

Nancy Leathers: (inaudible not into the mike)

Al right.

Don Boyken: Lee do you have another question?

Lee Duncan: Yes sir I am getting to it. Item #7 on page 98. The comment that I am making here is that I don't see any recommendations in this that deals with post development and in one of the critical areas of our environmental regulations is a focus on the construction process until the homeowner takes over and then there is no post development encouragement, no post development studies or anything that gets to the John Q homeowner and you need to be more in tune to that in this particular recommendation in this particular part of the policy.

Nancy Leathers: I beg you pardon which particular number was it?

Lee Duncan: #7 is what triggered my thought process on this is that we are dealing strictly right now with pre-move in if you will and you know when the John Q homeowners out there blowing leaves down a drop inlet structure, John Q homeowner is cleaning up paint cans, John Q homeowner is building a play pen in the tree save area and we have lost control at that point in time. We have lost the point of all this stuff that we went through during the construction and the development process. There needs to be some level of statement here that just says this is responsibility not of just one industry but of the whole citizenry if we are going to make this work.

Item #2 on page 99 To encourage the impermeable services for parking lots and non-residential multi- family apartments developments. I would like to add sidewalks to that as well.

Parking lots and sidewalks?

Lee Duncan: I know there is going to be some questions that come up but I think there is product available on the market place that would at least be semi-permeable as opposed to just…

Wayne Thatcher: Do you want to make that amendment #2.

Lee Duncan: We are on 2? Okay.

Does something like that really need an amendment or can that be a staff change note?

Nancy Leathers: We can change it but if there are general concurrences we can go ahead…

Don Boyken: While you're on this page I would like to go back to 98, #13. I do not like the whole concept that is in this booklet that we are going to take streams out of pipes and create open streams again as a matter of practice. This is one area that will cause more erosion when you have the streams taken out of the pipes and then cause more down stream silting. You increase the setback areas from what you can develop. You wind up with less land developing to the developed the land. This is one of those areas which I would like to see at least the…. I don't mind the first sentence in #13 but the second sentence should be removed. I would like to make that amendment #3.

Nancy Leathers: Okay I have got it.

Lee Duncan: We cleaned up language on a couple of things Nancy?

Nancy Leathers: Yes.

Lee Duncan: I asked Nancy and Michael, I am trying to figure out on page 101 redevelopment policies. It says provide incentives for the redevelopment of obsolete commercial areas along the Roswell Road corridor and I was questioning what that really meant and where is the Roswell Road corridor that is references here?

Nancy Leathers: The Roswell Road corridor is all of Roswell Road because generally speaking the plan calls for the redevelopment and varying levels of development and but all of Roswell Road is some form of redevelopment. From the

river to the City of Atlanta.

Lee Duncan: Incentives examples might be....

Nancy Leathers: They may be financial, I think we discussed it you indicated that you wanted to maybe amend that to indicate provide incentives or bonuses which would be another way of dealing with it because if you get to the policy section later on the particular town center there is discussion about density bonuses that you might get if you meet certain criteria. So you may want to say incentives or bonuses here.

Lee Duncan: Do you understand where I was going to?

Yes.

Donald Boyken: Lee is that you want to add is bonuses?

Lee Duncan: Yes that would be fine Don. I am just trying to broaden it.

Bob Wiley: Then we need to say it is #4.

Lee Duncan: Okay.

Don Boyken: I feel that like I can make recommendation the real one is going to come up in the number.

Lee Duncan: Keep track of my numbers will you Don?

Nancy Leathers: So far we are together.

Lee Duncan: 102 the land use policies for protective neighborhoods just for everybody's processes. All of the reference to protective neighborhoods that is a proper term by definition and they will be capitalizing in reference to protected neighborhood in this section of the land use policies?

Page 103 Item #2 We go down about the fourth line from single family detached residential properties and neighborhoods outward to higher density detached housing to attached housing... I did not understand what neighborhoods outward meant and we had a discussion about that and we are going to make some change, we will recommend changes.

Michael Zehner: Mr. Duncan would you like staff to go through the technical typographical issues quickly?

Lee Duncan: That would be terrific.

Michael Zehner: I can do that and you can tell if I have missed any.

Lee Duncan: You're great.

Michael Zehner: We will reword that because neighborhoods outwards referred to a movement in direction from the neighborhoods to the higher density detached housing so we will reword that at the bottom of page 103 number 7 that needed to address area and lot width. Area is picked up but lot width is not and I do know that one of the concerns you have had and whether or not that provision you may want to expand on this one. Whether or not that was a reasonable provision with the 80% of the remaining lots or rather that the new lots not are less than 80% of the area or width of the existing lots.

Moving on to page 109 under land use policies living working areas item #2. A variety of housing types including multi-family which match identified housing needs. I believe there was some concern of where and how and who identified housing needs.

Lee Duncan: I didn't want us to get in a situation where we are expecting to have a marketing analysis come in here every time we are getting ready to look at something like this when I didn't know what the criteria called for when somebody was trying to satisfy the match identified housing needs portion of that sentence.

Wayne Thatcher: If it makes it clearer you can just take those words out which match identified housing needs and it would read easier and be the same.

Lee Duncan: I am okay with that.

Which number is that?

Number 2.

Wayne Thatcher: Is that number 5 Nancy?

Michael Zehner: Yes I believe it is. Item #9, item D, E and F. D being restoration of pipe streams, E referring only to green space and F provisions for wider buffers. I believe Mr. Duncan was concerned with these being policy. We did attention to the fact that these if you read item #9 provided incentives in support of mixed use redevelopment in live work areas and the following list includes actions which has been identified as qualifying for incentives so restoration of pipe streams, the addition of open space in addition to green space and a provision for wider buffers. Those are items that qualify are not necessary mandatory actions.

Don Boyken: What incentives do have in mind?

Michael Zehner: Again I think it refers to incentives and bonuses whether it is through density and high?? For Mayor and City Council have talked about increased heights, people have increased open space or green space certainly you would get an increase in open space and green space if you were to add additional or wider buffers. I think that some of those packages this is kind of a general view and I think that once this is passed I think the Council will have an opportunity to define exactly what type of bonuses.

Lee Duncan: Explain to me Michael, how when you are sitting across the table from a developer providing for wider buffers is an incentive? Give an example of how that works?

Michael Zehner: That is not an incentive to them but there may be an ordinance or it may just be run by policy where it could either be. If it where policy we would say the Council has indicated and the comprehensive plan indicates that there would be incentives what ever those may be. There will be bonuses should you do any of these items here or one or a collection of these items and if there is an ordinance that is created down the road after this policy is adopted that defines the bonuses and incentives, exactly what those would be and criteria; it may be so much as say that if you ….. the standard for open space or green space is 20% but if you were to provide 40% you could go up an additional two stories. That is kind of hypothetical but that would be my understanding of that.

Don Boyken: Let me ask a question, does that mean that you are going to be creating deals with these developers as they come and then they are going to bring to us with your recommendation with them and if we turn them down we have essentially removed your deals. I am not….

Michael Zehner: Not necessarily I think if you read through the policies in here most of them are at the leisure of the judgment of the Planning Commission and the Mayor and City Council so it is not something where staff would necessarily judge it, it is more so that the Council would have an ability to say yes or no, yes or no. There are many ordinances throughout the country that provide for a floor area ratio or density bonuses, height bonuses, for providing desirable attributes to the city or desirable features in projects. It is not uncommon that is done.

Lee Duncan: Conservation subdivision is similar in nature to that Don.

Michael Zehner: That is almost actually right, that is correct.

Lee Duncan: It provides with a certain level of incentive if you will but it is actually structured in the ordinance so the open space you save the more densities you are able to get whether if you go up or down or how ever you do it.

Michael Zehner: With conservation subdivision ordinances you have to think about it this way. Most of the time you are dealing with a set minimum square footage for a lot and if you are not granted that bonus you are basically as a developer and Mr. Duncan correct me if I am wrong, you are basically obligated to develop some of the poor portions of a property because you have a minimum lot size but if you are having a ability to conserve that area that is less desirable for development purposes maybe through topho or wetlands then you are reducing your development cost because you can reduce your lot sizes and get a density bonus out of it.

Moving on I will bring this up under the town center on page 111. There should be a height of 8 stories listed.

Wayne Thatcher: What number is that?

Michael Zehner: Sorry that is number 6 and there should be a height of 8 stories listed.

That should be number E then?

Michael Zehner: Page 112 this is E just before 8,

Don Boyken: E was that the omission?

Michael Zehner: It was approved by the CAC. On page 112 item E, provide for the relocation of utilities underground or at the rear of new developments. Mr. Duncan indicated that at the rear of was probably not the best language because it

might lead a misunderstanding of what that was. We came up with possibly inconspicuous locations or something along those lines so it is not so difficult to judge.

On page 113 under vision #4 which, I am just recognizing those are miss-numbered as in 1, 4 and 5. Under vision item B, the assemblage of multiple properties is not necessarily encouraged in this area and I think that we wanted to take that out and indicate that the assemblage of multiple properties is supported in this area something along those lines.

Lee Duncan: The elimination of curb cuts is what you are after, I believe.

Michael Zehner: Correct. On page 114 under vision, item 2B, commercial uses shall be less intense, residential uses should be of a high end nature. We did not necessarily have a definition for what is high end. Mr. Duncan indicated that it should be changed possibly from high end nature to compliment existing properties. Commercial uses shall be less intense; residential uses should compliment existing properties.

Bob Wiley: Is that really what we want to compliment existing properties?

Lee Duncan: I honestly don't know what that node wants.

Bob Wiley: I don't either. I hadn't focused on where that section of property is.

Lee Duncan: All that I was looking is how would I qualify what is a residential development of a high end nature. That doesn't give me any real direction on what is going on here. I really don't know what that means?

Don Boyken: It could be in style also rather than....

Lee Duncan: It doesn't give me the direction I would like to have to guide myself through the process as in relation to this particular property.

Michael Zehner: If I can kind of interject here I think most of these are the way we establish them is with the assumption that there will ultimately be more defined design guidelines for maybe each of these nodes but generally for the living working areas and at that time when we worked to define an ordinance or an overlay or a design guideline that this policy might give some direction as far as high end nature but I understand where it might need some clarification.

Wayne Thatcher: Either that or you are going to have to add a definition back here.

Michael Zehner: We talked about that as well but I think we understand the intent of the high end nature but we might want to change that verbiage.

Don Boyken: Lee do you want to continue?

Lee Duncan: I am going let Michael do it he is doing a good job.

Michael Zehner: On page 116, under Power's Ferry at I-285, three guidelines and policies B. Project should incorporate significant green space to account for the proximity of the node to the Chattahoochee River. Mr. Duncan indicated that these products simply need to comply with MRPA (Metropolitan River Protection Act) 3B.

On page 118, this is B at the top. Automobile oriented businesses shall be designed as so not to locate garages, fuel pumps, and other service types of operation adjacent to the intersection. Mr. Duncan was concerned that we were prohibiting and this is at the Northridge and Roswell intersection, that we would be prohibiting service station garages from immediately adjacent to that intersection and the intent was to locate the pumps, etc... further back from the intersection. Those properties might be developed as those types of uses but the buildings would need to be closer to the intersection and the garage bays or pumps would need to be located toward the rear.

That is two out of the three corners?

Michael Zehner: We anticipate that one of those is going to come and redevelop.

Lee Duncan: I misunderstood what this is saying in here and it is not saying don't develop it as an automobile type support services. It is just saying design and the contents of that development so it is not mud on the street.

Michael Zehner: Again going towards the future where we hope these can generate some design guidelines to giving a nod to that in the future. On the next heading north east corner of Roswell Road and Dunwoody Place within a plan? I believe that is the last note I have Mr. Duncan.

Lee Duncan: We did a little clean up work back here. Page 144 under protected neighborhood, I am showing my ignorance folks but I did not know what a curvilinear road was which is .... I found that out it is a curvy road but I never heard the term before. Under protected neighborhood specialty land uses it is referencing here public institution and park

recreation uses in addition to detached dwelling; I guess I am wondering why not attached as well?

Michael Zehner: The intent on that was that most of the protected neighborhood don't exhibit an attached product there generally single family neighborhoods. I think that all of them are single family neighborhoods.

Lee Duncan: In the future if the new neighborhood is brought under that protected neighborhood category?

Michael Zehner: That is an attached product. I am sure that it can happen. I can imagine circumstances where it could happen but the Council and the Planning Commission would have to judge it at that time.

Isn't the protected neighborhood something within this plan? They took the city map and sort of draw circles around the areas that they consider protected neighborhoods?

Michael Zehner: Generally they are the single family subdivisions.

By protected I got the impression, at least from all the stuff, that I was reading, is that you don't go here and try to increase the densities. Upon the commitment that City Council has made.

Nancy Leathers: The intent is to deal with the character of those neighborhoods that is not modifying the lot sizes and the setbacks.

So attached would not work?

Lee Duncan: It might we just don't know. Deal with it down the road I guess is what I am hearing. Under item #4 urban residential specific land uses it references garden style apartments, simple townhouses and I did not know what a garden style apartment was.

Nancy Leathers: The term goes to three to four story apartments that don't have elevators and fall under what we traditionally call the A apartments zoning districts.

Lee Duncan: Then sliding over to the right future land use plan categories. Residential categories with density of 8 units or more per acre. 8 units or more per acre, am I reading that correctly?

Michael Zehner: It is quite possible we talked about this might too broad of a range and we can look at these other categories to see if we can't put a cap on residential density at least associated with apartments, this does capture the townhouse developments when it goes down to 8 but it is pretty wide open when you get above that.

Lee Duncan: I have seen apartments any where from 12 units to an acre to 100 units in an acre and I would suspect to make apartment numbers work if you are going to be encouraging that, you probably need to look a little bit more closely at that number and see where you want to be. Probably in the zoning and somewhere in the range of the low 20s.

Michael Zehner: Just looking at this, this is what the character area land use policy there probably should have been or could be re-labeling of this category is possibly something like suburban or ex-urban residential and capping at maybe 8 to 14 and then adding another category with 14 and above for apartments and condos.

Wayne Thatcher: Is that a good job for the future planner?

Michael Zehner: That is right exactly.

Lee Duncan: Just to bring the attention of everybody under item 5, type form style of development principle with new urbanism. Is that a proper term it is defined in the glossary, new urbanism? It probably needs to be first of all capitalized and then if we have not taken a minute or two we probably need to glance over and make sure that we understand what new urbanism really means and what is referring in the glossary section. The same under item 9 principles of transit oriented development carries the same definition. I did not know what that really meant and I have been to many different planning sessions and new urbanism seems to have a definition du jour depending on who you are talking to. Transit oriented development does have a very precise development compact development built around transit stops especially at rural transit development that is located within a 10 minute walk or approximately 5/10 of a mile from the light rail, heavy rail or commuter rail station and also includes development along heavily used bus rapid transit quarters. Transit oriented development is characterized by a mix of uses including housing, retail, office, research, civic and other uses.

Bob Wiley: What page are you reading off of?

Lee Duncan: That is in the glossary page 216. I would just like to point out transit oriented development that is literally Roswell Road folks. By definition Roswell Road would need a transit oriented development.

Wayne Thatcher: They are all transit oriented areas of....

Abernathy, Peachtree Dunwoody…

Bob Wiley: That is why they call it regional transit I think.

Lee Duncan: New urbanism is a neat idea I guess but I am not sure if it is ever really materialized in this community. It is a set of principles (inaudible) that suggest neighborhoods should be built like those that existed before the advent of the automobile. This is community is very much dependent on the automobile and I think that we could shoot in that direction but I hope that we don't get frustrated trying to achieve it. I think that is all I got Mr. Chair.

Bob Wiley: Does anybody else have any questions?

Susan Maziar: Page 109, actually page 111, 6C this is under town center node I am actually going to talk about all the nodes and open and green space. 6C says under town center node open/green space 15% is it open or green? Because to me they are extremely different. One is impervious surface, open space is impervious surface and green space….

Michael Zehner: That is not necessarily the case. Open space includes green space and green space does not include open space.

Susan Maziar: If we don't ask for green you could get impervious surface.

You could get basketball courts or….

Susan Maziar: I think that is right we just had a rezoning case where this came up. I think that when you are encouraging pedestrian activity and higher density that we should require green space.

Nancy Leathers: I think the purpose in putting them together and you may decide how you wish to handle it but I think the intent was in the town center in particular they were looking for plazas and active areas where people can gather and congregate as well as green space and I think that is why they put them together.

Susan Maziar: We can have that too but I would like to make that an amendment and I am not sure what amendment we are on.

Bob Wiley: How do you want to amend it?

Susan Maziar: Either saying open space 15% and green space 15%?

Don Boyken: That means a total of 30?

Susan Maziar: Or just green space 15%? I think that if you say either or you are not going to get….

Wayne Thatcher: Your concern is green space if you say that you want 15% minimum green space then you will have 15% open space which is the same thing. If we want to make sure if we have green space then we need to define it as 15% only green space.

Susan Maziar: These nodes are all going to be high density nodes. I think that is not a huge concession to be asking for, 15% green space.

Wayne Thatcher: Let's think about this 15% of an acre is an acre that is roughly 43,000 feet, 15% would make it almost 6,000 or 7,000 square feet per acre at 15% would have to be green. On top of that you are now going to lose area for your open space which is going to be your plazas and areas and your building footprint.

Susan Maziar: All your buffers and landscape strips count as green space.

Don Boyken: Yes, but if I am building a 20 acre the buffer is only around the outside it is not all the way through the site.

Susan Maziar: The zoning case that we just had what just came up there was no concession of true green space.

Bob Wiley: I guess where I am heading is that I don't know that we can say that it has to be 15% green space. I know what you are trying to achieve……

Nancy Leathers: Let me ask you this question and you may just decide how you want to handle it. If you want to set an upper figure of open space and green space of which a certain portion of that has to be green space that may address it. It seems to me when you are in a town center, you probably looking as plazas as being part of what you want not just green space and so you may want to have some combination. If you can set an upper figure for the combination, a minimum figure…..

15% or a third of it being green.

Susan Maziar: How about 10% being green? Or we can vote on it.

Don Boyken: You are talking about a lot of areas and dense areas that are probably going to have great little buffers especially in what we talk about are the town center. You are not going to have very big buffers around the edges of the property.

Susan Maziar: I think that exchange for all the tremendous density that is coming, maybe 15%.

Bob Wiley: The map is only based on 6,800 people joining our city in 10 years.

Susan Maziar: I thought the whole idea of live work designation was to go up in height in exchange for green. If that is the whole primus behind all of these new land use designations.

Lee Duncan: You are looking at a maximum commercial density of 25,000 square foot per acre and you are looking at a maximum residential density of 20 units per acre. That is not a whole of density when you are talking about here. Now if you might want to triple those numbers then you are encouraging somebody to get to work and figure out a way to do that. You are cutting both ways on these things and you need to be careful where you are heading to Susan.

Don Boyken: I know what you are trying to achieve but I don't think that the numbers are right.

Susan Maziar: We can talk about. Roswell Road and I-285 it is the same thing 15% open and green space. This one doesn't have a slash this one has the word and… it is on the next page 112.

Lee Duncan: The way I am reading this and I think that the Committee did a pretty good job in looking at this they said shall not include parking lots. I think that is the primary pervious surface conditions I think that we would be concerned about and what Nancy said anytime you are doing a landscape plan it is going to include some hard scape and a landscape plan whether it be sidewalks or a bench areas or whatever it might be.

Susan Maziar: If you go to the next 9 nodes it only says 10% open space it doesn't even have green space. 9 nodes along Roswell Road and one says Power's Ferry. We are not encouraging any green space and 9 out of 11 nodes.

Michael Zehner: I think that was more of a typographical error than the intent.

Don Boyken: Then let's fix that.

Michael Zehner: We can do that we can add and green space.

Susan Maziar: I am disappointed I think that it should say 10% green space and I would like to vote on it. I think that a huge amount of density not have a little bit of green in all 9 nodes. They are all community live work. There was one neighborhood.

Wayne Thatcher: That was #7 Nancy?

Nancy Leathers: Yes.

Lee Duncan: Just so you have a sense of portion, on the one acre site normally with the parking requirements and other things, the maximum that you are going to get in terms of a surface area for an office is probably 12 -13,000 square feet. That is the whole thing and create the parking support that you need for that and the most you can really do is somewhere in that range. If you take 4,000 square feet and set that aside, you are really cutting into the heart of the financial model with that property.

Susan Maziar: I think that it is thought to be a confession.

Lee Duncan: If you were banking this you might have different thoughts about it.

Wayne Thatcher: You have to remember that these are policies and not….

Lee Duncan: I understand I just don't to discourage quality developers from looking at Sandy Springs for opportunities.

Susan Maziar: I don't want to encourage developers to just go the minimum.

Page 136, Joey Mayson brought up that the Community Advisory Committee …… number 11, I thought we should vote on that. He said that policy #11 should not be in there.

Lee Duncan: That is correct.

Where are we?

Bob Wiley: Page 136 policy #11.

Is that #8 Nancy?

Nancy Leathers: Yes that is would be #8.

Susan Maziar: That was all I had.

Don Boyken: Page #46. This is something that we were talking about before. This is a basic flaw in this plan. It assumes that we are only going to have 6,800 new residents join Sandy Springs in the next ten years and based on all these statistics we are seeing over the next ten years it is indeed expected that 30% growth in the state of Georgia and the city of Atlanta is expected. At our current rate there should be somewhere around 27,000 people should be what we are expecting. If were just in line with everybody else. We need to talk about how we are going to update this and deal with because most specifically everywhere you go in here that is how we are setting the budget for the city and the number of police, firemen, and the number of fire stations the road improvements, the street improvements everything is based off that population number. It is a basic flaw. You shared with us earlier it was something that the City Council approved as a basis for the start of the study. I don't whether I need to make an amendment but there needs to be something in here that goes back that says they are wrong or the City Council is wrong and that it is four times this amount.

Bob Wiley: I think the easiest way to handle that would be a note or directive to the City Council when we pass this thing on to them that they need to revalidate the population figures that they are using in this report.

Don Boyken: For their budgeting and the planning of their own services. Because we are going to be undersized if we use this going forward for 2008 and 2009 and so forth.

Lee Duncan: I agree totally with what you are saying and what I would like to ask is when we participate in this process and I am fine with that, that I would like to see this be elevated from beyond the Comprehensive Land Use Plan to adopting a Comprehensive Transportation that marries up the different nodes if you will from point A to point B and then follow that up with building a financial model that reflects anticipated revenue and anticipated expenditures to support that expanded population and infrastructure services that are going to be required to be provided.

Bob Wiley: Would you like to have the representative from Carter Burgess give us an update on what the transportation model is and where it stands right now?

Lee Duncan: It is Bob's time whatever he wants to do at this point.

Bob Wiley: Well Don was speaking that is the reason why....

Susan Maziar: Can you finish the rest of your thoughts?

The next one I am on is on page 52 you may have already caught this. #35 on the third line down should that word be retention and not detention?

Nancy Leathers: I never can remember but I will check it.

If we are going to create a pond that is detained or if we are just going to retain it so that it then flows out into the streams we don't overflow the streams, then it is retain.

Lee Duncan: The proper term is detained. It is a temporary hold. If you retain essentially what you are doing is that you are building a bathtub with no plug. If you are going retain.

I got it backwards.

Lee Duncan: Yes, detention is the proper term.

Bob Wiley: The next one that I have is on page 61. #69 can somebody explain what the Committee is trying to accomplish by #69?

Michael Zehner: Basically we have a zoning that requires a minimum lot 5, of 2 acres and a significant portion.... The majority of the property in the city is zoned R1 is in the southwest corner of the city and the intent was that the 0 to 1 unit per acre land use designation did not necessarily give a clear picture that the intent is to maintain the 2 acre minimum lot size in that area. So that is why you see on your map a 0 to 0.5 land use designation and those properties are in the primarily zoned R1 and meet the 2 acre minimum lot size and if they don't they are zoned R1. They are grandfathered.

Basically it was a community value that those lots sizes and those densities are higher lot sizes and lower densities is maintained in that area.

Bob Wiley: Page 62 item 72. I am trying to understand the chart. 60 foot, 50 foot, 60 foot dwelling proposed dwelling the heights. What are we trying to say there?

Michael Zehner: There is some school of thought that bulk in size or heights of homes pardon the term, Mcmansions, might have issues fitting into some of the existing subdivisions existing neighborhoods. We have not heard that as so much of an issue in Sandy Springs. More so being the issue or being the infill issue of incompatible lot sizes and incompatible densities. Basically I think that these are issues and opportunities that were presented to the citizen's of the city to vote on. These are not necessarily policies per say, that we are putting forward but that the CAC has put forward there are points of discussion that were presented to the citizens. This one effectively addressing infill to this manner to limiting house size or limiting height or limiting bulk was not seen as something that the CAC or citizens wanted to put forward.

Wayne Thatcher: Right now we do not have an infill housing policy.

Michael Zehner: We don't have one in the sense that most communities in the Metro area. We have a policy that affects lots sizes and seek to maintain lot sizes and lot width and densities. Not the infill policy that affects house size.

Nancy Leathers: There has been a good deal of discussion over the last year about the issue of whether the size of the house is an issue or whether it is the character of the lots, the setbacks, the width of the lot, the size of the lots and generally what came down was that the latter was the issue that people wanted addressed and it is really what is addressed in the planning terms of policies.

Don Boyken: Page 67.
Michael Zehner: If I could draw your attention really quick to page 63 I think that addresses the infill housing issue that is more apparently to the city rather than the illustrations on page 62. Just to bring it to your attention.

Don Boyken: Page 67. This is a chart which all the other charts are derived off of as far as calculations for services provided by the city. In the next 20 years it shows we, if I have my math right, about 6,800 folks. That is all that we are going to get in 20 years. If you count another statistics and it is 2.1 people per house, so it is roughly 34 dwelling units 3,300 dwelling units. If my understanding of what is going to happen and the regional area is not correct. It is not going to be 3,300 it is going to be some where around 12,000 almost 13,000 dwelling units. The question I had for the Committee is, is the land use plan and the increased density that we have in this land use plan does it accommodate up to 13,000 additional housing units? If you have already planned for it then at least the plan the way that we have laid out, where we are going to put the density is correct but if it doesn't then we have got another basic flaw.

Michael Zehner: Basically Chairman Rupnow asked previously for staff to show a difference in residential land use from the interim plan to the proposed plan and how much of a difference in terms of housing units there was? There is not a great deal of a difference between the interim plan and the proposed plan. There is an increase but as a total build out and I don't have the numbers with me I wish I had brought those with me there is more than adequate ability under the land use plan to accommodate that growth and more if necessary.

Don Boyken: So we have in the overall map and plan we have got over 13,000 residential units allowed for in that plan?

Michael Zehner: Yes.

Lee Duncan: How are you going to? Ms. Heard's Creek is showing a net housing increase of 115 houses. Where would that be in Heard's Creek?

Nancy Leathers: Keep in mind that these are estimates and it is not intended that you be able to go back and show lot by lot where the increase is what occurred. That is just a statistical figure for that particular area.

Lee Duncan: I see eventually a new subdivision.

Michael Zehner: If you are looking at Heard's Creek it covers the area around Power's Ferry and New Northside at 285 so I would say that you would see a lot of the growth around 285 and that interchange.

Lee Duncan: I see a lot of transition from one type of housing to another housing. I am not sure that I am going to see 115 new houses built in that area. Maybe I am missing some open space.

Michael Zehner: It might not be houses it could be units, housing units which could be in the form of condominiums or apartments or town homes as well.

Nancy Leathers: Keep in mind that a fair number of the additional units that you have the potential to accommodate in the city are in the various live work areas and not just in the residential areas that you see on the map. To the contrary,

the goal of the council has been to maintain and protect those neighborhoods not to significantly increase densities in those areas and to place those kinds of uses in the redevelopment areas.

Lee Duncan: It has been clearly thought through is the question that Don is asking and I know that I am asking how 858 units can be plugged in somewhere into a Marsh Creek corridor and I don't know, I suppose that you have live work areas in there that might be able to provide that and I just don't know.

Michael Zehner: That area of Marsh Creek in particular would include the intersection of Roswell Road and Abernathy, Abernathy and 400…..

Actually it does not Michael.

Michael Zehner: Yes it does. All of these areas where you see significant growth and even the ones where you don't at least all of them incorporate some portion of a live work regional node with the exception of Crooked Creek I believe.

Lee Duncan: But to follow up now with Don's point if the population project are literally a third to a quarter of what we are going to actually experience, would it not make sense to go back and revisit this net housing with an increase number and try to figure out how that is going to be accommodated in the city or are we just going to lock the gates up when we reach 6,898?

Nancy Leathers: Remember what we have talked about in terms of the continuing reassessment plan. If the development begins to occur more rapidly we will indicate that we are going to regularly reassess the plan. We are required within five years to go back and re-look in any event. But there is the ability to reassess in the interim. Should the expectations that are in this plan and should the standards that were used to develop it then you have got the ability to go back and re–look at that? That is part of the changing nature of the community.

Lee Duncan: I am okay with that but I am tired of being reactive. My feeling is our job here is to be as proactive as we possibly can. We need to define areas as opposed to an outside force putting pressure on us, internally we identifying where those pockets are that we can provide for this population surge that we are expecting to get. Right now what I hear us doing is waiting a year or two and then we are going to see what happens. I would much prefer and I think that Don is in the same position, is that we start thinking a little more forward on these issues in particular in knowing when it is coming.

Nancy Leathers: I think it is something you want to say to the Council. Keeping in mind that the staff is reflecting back to you a decision the Council has already made and we are not in the position to recommend a change to you but that is part what we would expect that you would come back and recommend to Council.

Don Boyken: I think the point that I am trying to underline here is that we only have one quarter of the density that should be expected over this next twenty years. In five years we are already going to exceed what we were showing here in the plan and that is problem. As Lee has said, we are going to reacting, playing catch up and we need to be thinking and planning way ahead. You are right Nancy, it is something this Council has used and Mr. Vice Chairman we are going to need to tell them somehow in our recommendation in moving this thing forward that they have under planned for what growth is actually going to happen in Sandy Springs.

Bob Wiley: In our cover notes we will indicate that they need to reassess and validate the population figures.

Don Boyken: I guess I am still on the floor here. I am on page 71 the chart down there only shows that we are only going to have 3,000 units.

Lee Duncan: You must have had a lot playing time this week.

Don Boyken: I won't tell you where I read all this. I think I already did tell you where I was. Again, on page 71 again these numbers are all driven by the low numbers of population. My next one is some of these you may already have caught, 98 you have already caught and 99 you caught. I am on page 101 and 8 at the top of the page. Can you help me out as far how we are going to accomplish this?

Michael Zehner: You said #8?

Bob Wiley: #8 at the top of page 101.

Wayne Thatcher: For those who don't have a book to read he is talking about the health care industries and an expansion of hospitals and where they are going to put them.
Nancy Leathers: There is available space even in the Pill Hill area that we are extinguishing and there is contemplation of expansion of some of those facilities already being developed.

I think that Joel has some and I think Scottish Wright might have a little of area left back behind some of the office buildings.

Nancy Leathers: There is another quadrant that serves both of them which is the area to the west of Meridian Market south of Johnson's Ferry, the one between the two hospitals and there is expansion room in there and there is a contemplation and part of it is owned by north side and part of it own by Children's. There is a fairly good sized area in there of expansion. Part of it has been discussed already and part of it is being held for future expansion.

Bob Wiley: We are going to look at the transportation plan some time when we are doing that.

Page 102, under land use policies #4, infill development you want to limit it to the current density.

Michael Zehner: Or densities that are consistent with the neighborhood.

Nancy Leathers: That goes back to our earlier discussion about maintaining the size of the lot, the setbacks of the lots, the width of the lots, but not necessarily maintaining the house size in those protected neighborhoods.

Lee Duncan: What happens in that instance where the Comprehensive Land Use Plan may call for 3 to 5 units per acre but the property was developed out at 1 to 2 units to an acre or it would depend on a lot things not necessarily the land use plan or what it was developed out as but more likely the zoning as well. We have some neighborhoods that are zoned completely one way however they were not developed at the maximum amount of density and those neighborhoods as well have some ability to build out under that zoning classification at a higher density than the neighborhood developed as. They would have that right to do that and we would have no ability to prohibit them to develop under their zoning. But the problem is it would take some assemblage of those properties to be able to get any significant increase in density. However an increase in density because of lot widths and things of that nature and we have the Vernon Woods Subdivision as an excellent case of point.

It is all zoned R3 which is a minimum lot size of 18,000 square feet which is about 2.42 units per acre but the subdivision is develop out total at less than 2. I think it is roughly 1 and ¼ if not 1.4. If someone were to come in and pick up 5 or 10 lots they could redevelop under R3 standards and possibly notch up densities but if they were to come in and acquire those same 5 to 10 lots and want to rezone with the expectation that they could increase the density within the 2 to 3 units per acre range, we would be judging it by that 2 to 3 and we would be judging it by the fact the bulk of the zoning in the neighborhood is R3 and with the protected neighborhood status it would not necessarily be consistent with the neighborhood.

Don Boyken: I know of a zoning that we dealt with on (inaudible) action that month that is along Robert's Road that were we took a single lot and made it two lots and right next door to that is another lot of twice the size and then will wind up coming back potentially 4 or 5 lots to come back and fill in there. The surrounding property is 1 unit per acre or 1 ½ units per acre somewhere because it is near Baker's Glenn and I forget what the other road is there. The unfortunate part in this land use plan we are now saying it is going to be 2 to 3 units per acre.

Michael Zehner: I believe it is 1 to 2 now and that area has not been changed. I can assure you we have not made a change to that area Robert's Drive.

That is going to be protected under this new program?
Michael Zehner: I am not sure if that is a protected neighborhood but I can tell that there are trends in that area where the west side of Robert's is closer to 400 is allowed a higher density than the east. We don't just look at the land use plan in a vacuum. We also look at the trends on the ground and the zoning that is applied to those properties. There are many criteria that we have to look at. I don't every one to think that just because we have designated a property at 1 to2 or 2 to 3 that is the absolute and that is the highest range that you can get. You have to keep in mind this is a 20/25 land use plan not a plan that has to be affected today. There are other trends that a neighborhood or an area may not be in that mode to transition to a higher end of that development range at that time.

Don Boyken: Is ??? protected on the little map?

Susan Maziar: I was just asking and I am just courageous now, is Robert's Drive the particular part of Robert's Drive that came before us is it protected?

Michael Zehner: It is listed in a protected neighborhood.

Lee Duncan: When you are working with the document after it is adopted and you come across in a site or an area that might be characterized as infill, when you make your recommendation to take under consideration financial impacts on the area. For instance, it might be a depressed if you will, area and it might be effective for a person to come in and be do some rebuilding in there and how does all that tie together when you are working with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the guy walks in and got 6 houses and he wants to put 10 houses where the six houses use to be and the 6 houses were in all kind of conditions that were less than desirable, how would you as a planner work on that?

Michael Zehner: You may be familiar with the Steinberg criteria and 1 of the 9 is whether or not the current zoning is economically viable for the property. We do usually make that determination as best we can. Again we don't have any

background in appraising property but we can always look at comparable development and comparable sales in the area and see there are people that are building and there are people that are using these lots at these sizes the viable nature. We do look at that and that is just one piece of the puzzle.

Wayne Thatcher: Page 103. This is just a hot button for me 3A when you talk about opaque fences. Unfortunately they rot and after about five or six years that start falling down. How do we impose maintenance of those?

Michael Zehner: If it is a condition of zoning or if it is even shown on the LDP plan or a fence plan, they are obligated to maintain that so if we find that it is not being maintained or it is disrepair they would be found in violation of property maintain and/or also condition of zoning.

Wayne Thatcher: Can we include in your recommendation that if that is the type of fencing they tend to use that it needs to maintained according to codes as part of your recommendation?

Michael Zehner: Sure.

Nancy Leathers: What you need to understand is that in the past a lot of these were not enforced. As you know we now go out and enforce some of these things and if we become aware of it we will go out and deal with it and encourage people to look at the maintenance cost of these things because if they put something up it is difficult to maintain they have got a problem.

Don Boyken: Then they are going to lay it on the homeowner who doesn't have money.

Don Boyken: 109 was picked up. 118, one of the comments and I trying to understand from the planning staff how we are going to deal with this. One of the comments that I keep getting back from developers regarding the area of the north west corner of Roswell and Dunwoody Place is that this will never get developed as a high density node just simply because there is no access to it. The access that they are referring to is the access from the north crossing the river where it is just so poor it is just a four lane bridge, where the access is coming in from 400 as you got to down Dunwoody or Dunwoody Place which is also very poor. I know that this is target area we want to see redeveloped so I want to understand what your thoughts are on that.

Mark Moore: There is currently a CIP project for a redesign and systemic upgrade of Dunwoody Place. It is really looking at making it a uniformed section as you know and I am sure that you are familiar with the road that it goes from two to four lanes sometimes with rather an alarming abruptness and does not have a uniformed characteristic and does have quite a number of problematic intersections operationally. I believe that we are getting ready to announce consultant selection for conceptual design that has been budgeted in this year's capitol improvements to go forth with concept and the initial primarily engineering. That project being online soon would certainly help some of the access to the 400 corridor. We are somewhat limited by GDOT's interest in improving our bridge crossing on Roswell Road which is also a state route when it comes to going directly to the north but I think that we certainly can make great strides to improve the direct access to the 400 corridor and are planning to do so.

The 400 connection at North Ridge?

Mark Moore: My understanding the developer with short-term upgrades that GDOT has (inaudible) a continuous work and upgrade at the North Ridge intersection is on the table and is forthcoming.

I didn't understand the collector distributor was going to come all the way up to....

Mark Moore: It is not but in that same timeframe is my understanding.

What same kind of timeframe is that?

Mark Moore: I want to say in the next few years but I have to get you specific information on that.

Nancy Leathers: I think the important issue is that if the city believes that this is an area that they want to focus on then the city will try to focus its transportation and its efforts with GDOT to do the improvements to the area to serve it and that is really where things are headed right now. That is why those things are such high priority for the city.

Bob Wiley: Just a side note that you can answer later, what the heck is taking so long at this intersection Dunwoody Place and Roswell Road because it has been that way for over a year.

Mark Moore: I will defer that and I will leave that a two second answer. GDOT is having some internal issues with their contract.

(Inaudible, someone in the background)

Speaking of people chopping at the bits.

Don Boyken: On page 126 under of objectives for recreation and parks #4. Could you explain what that is or is that what we are going to take out with the other one that Susan picked up?

Nancy Leathers: There is actually funding in place for the initial work on a pedestrian bridge going from Morgan Falls across the river just below the damn connecting to Cobb County. Those discussions have been held with Cobb as well. That is the project that the city has on going forward.

Lee Duncan: That is great park at Morgan Falls.

Don Boyken: Page 176. This is just a general observation. If we are going to create 21,000 new jobs in 20 years in the city, that only has 6,800 people by this plan I am wondering if we have undersized the impact to the city if we are really going to have 27,000 people in that period of time are we really going to have 80,000 jobs, has anybody even looked at that and what impact will have? How comfortable are we that we are only going to create 21 new thousand jobs here?

Nancy Leathers: I need to go back and check that I believe that came out of the ARC numbers but I am not absolutely certain so I am going to check that.

If that came out of the ARC numbers did they also come up with 6,800 at some point in time?

Nancy Leathers: I believe that the population is not consistent with the ARC projection although I don't believe that it is high as 27,000 but I believe that the employment projections were. I will check it.

Don Boyken: My observation and again this is for planning, if we are going to create 21,000 new jobs and have 6,800 new people if that is what we are planning? We are importing 13,000 on probably 6,000 to 13,000 car trips and I guess you multiply that trip times 2 so that is 26,000 car trips per day. What are we doing in the planning of our roads to accommodate that? It is even worse if my population numbers are off by a factor of 4 then the jobs are off by 4 then have got a heck of a lot more problems.

Bob Wiley: Then it is a transportation issue Mark.

Mark Moore: This would probably be the time where I actually defer to Carter& Burgess and to have them talk about our forthcoming efforts on a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan speak to that.

Richard Fangmann: Thanks Mark. My name is Richard Fangmann with Carter & Burgess and we have working on this plan along side with the staff and the CAC. What we have been doing to date is looking at these same projections that you are talking about as far as population and employment. The employment projections of the 21,000 additional employees had been figured into the modeling and the work that we have been doing that along with the 6,800 additional population. So we have looking at that issue specifically, one thing that does occur with the population and employment is that if you increase the population without necessarily increasing population there are some other folks who are maybe going elsewhere also from the city to work. The implication is that there maybe some more jobs that are taking within the city by folks who live in the city and now elsewhere but there is definitely a balance in that increase and we have seen that in our modeling as far as additional trips in those areas where employment is prevalent. Not the neighborhood areas but the areas near the town center and near the 400 corridor.

Lee Duncan: What is the imbalance element there that you are referring to?

Richard Fangmann: The fact that there are 21,000 additional jobs in about 6,000 additional employees. So there are more work related trips that are going to occur in the future.

Don Boyken: I think that you said that wrong there are 21,000 new jobs and 6,800 new people of which probably out of that 6,800 new people if you have 2.1 per family and only 1 ½ people on average would be a new employee. You are going to wind up running somewhere around 4,000 new people that are going to take jobs so we got a net increase of 17,000 more people that are coming to the city everyday and how are we dealing with that in our traffic planning? But what you just said is that you are using the numbers that are in this plan in your modeling. What are you doing about the under sizing of this plan?

Richard Fangmann: Like I said what we are doing right now is using the numbers that were adopted and put into the plan. We have done two other....

Don Boyken: Isn't that what we call Geico garbage in and garbage out? If you put wrong numbers in you are going to get wrong numbers out.

Richard Fangmann: We have done two other things as a request from the CAC as we have been trying to move forward in looking at this plan in particular with the downtown emerging town center area and just recently this area #39 I guess that you all will talking about later on this evening is to plug in some additional density in those areas above what we had

assumed in the plan to more reflect what the build out of those may be. So we have looked at them in a little more intense way to try to see how those multi-transportation. Those were two things that recognized that perhaps there may be more development that is included in the plan. For now as far as doing our traffic modeling we are using the amount of numbers adopted by Council and directed by staff and as we move ahead with this comprehensive transportation plan we will have the opportunity to guess look at more drill down in areas that have some more specific means. Especially in light of these potentially increased densities that may occur.

Don Boyken: So that was suppose to answer my question?

Lee Duncan: In reality his company is in charge……

Don Boyken: His company is in charge and he is doing exactly what he is charge for that is fine, I have no issue there. But I am concerned with is we even studying it? Are we even studying that we are going to bring in, if I have got my numbers right, 17,000 in new jobs in 20 years but effectively it will probably be less. But 17,000 new jobs or 34,000 car trips to the city. Potentially that much every day.

Mark Moore: Let me step back for just a moment and say that my understanding of the focus of the transportation element of the comprehensive plan is to support and validate and discuss the transportation effects and influences based on the assumptions and data that the overall comprehensive plan is based on and there were assumptions that were adopted by the Mayor and City Council and those are effectively the ground rules by which we have all been working. Now that having been said that is the support portion for the comprehensive plan. Obviously it is clear that you take umbrage with those assumptions and do with that as you will.

Don Boyken: I don't fault the assumptions made at the time but there has been new data made available and how we are going to deal with it.

Mark Moore: With doing a comprehensive transportation plan, it is certainly that my hope and staff and our discussions have gone to the area of looking at, and you can see all these maps behind you, if you look in the bottom right corner you get a little more context of where we are as a city in the region and looking at what the effects of the region are because frankly regardless of what we do, what surrounding jurisdictions do will have an impact on our transportation system. So I think that when you start doing a comprehensive transportation plan really looking at more focused a specific long range transportation planning that we are starting to do as a follow on to this, we will be sort of expanding our view to some extent to make sure that we are accommodating for that. If we are under developing based on that population growth, we are all basing, the models that Carter & Burgess are using based on ARC travel demand models. If you don't do the population here, the population is still going on around us and that is not going to reduce the amount of traffic we have got it is just going to change the character of it as to where it is coming from. The model is there and we will be working towards that goal of whatever we think the best predictive date is going to be.

Wayne Thatcher: My question is have you done any what if modeling? What if the population increases per what Don says, what happens then?

Richard Fangmann: Not to date because the only assumption that we have been working on under the comprehensive plan is the same one that the entire plan has been made under so we haven't gone through various what is other than to do some detailed modeling based on land use decisions within particular nodes that they have done at the request.

Don Boyken: Where would you be doing anything like that? You can sit there with your blinders on and go like this and if your plan goes outside a little bit you need to be prepared for it.

Mark Moore: The intention is to get a wide of a view that we can. We are talking about two different plans that serve somewhat different purposes and have somewhat difference focuses. I think that we will looking at a lot of more what if types of assumptions going forward in a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan then we have necessarily in the comp plan as it stands today.

Richard Fangmann: I guess what we are looking for is some guidance from staff as to…. This is based on some data in which a decision was made in this whole plak and we are now in the process and have new data which shows that the basic assumptions. These are foundation assumptions. A number of jobs and a new of people over a 20 year period and the new data that we have tell us that data is flawed and its entire plan now which is based off those two pieces of foundation information is also flawed? How do we move beyond this flaw to say that we are going to get it solved in a short period of time?

Don Boyken: That is recommendation from you guys is how we move this thing forward?

Lee Duncan: You know Don, I have wrestled with this for a couple of weeks and I have came to the realization that this document is meeting a state regulatory requirement and it allows Sandy Springs to bring into compliance with regulatory issues in the state regarding comprehensive land use plans and maybe we are doing a little bit too much of a good job here and maybe what we need to do is to share the concerns that we have with the City Council and allow the document to be transmitted with what we have got here but let City Council know that we understand and we know that are some

things coming down the road here folks that this is not going to address. We need to get busy and get on it right now and be thinking about this. This is not the end all or the cure all, this simply satisfies a state regulation that the city has to comply that they have a comprehensive land use plan in the hopper by a certain period of time. That doesn't mean that we quit doing our jobs, it just means that we have done enough work here where we can recognize how big the task is that is in front of us and all of us in Sandy Springs need to start rolling up our sleeves and start getting after this thing and figure out how we are going to handle it.

Don Boyken: I think that in our recommendation to the City Council along with the other things that we have mentioned about the population that we need to put in there that the what if scenarios need to be investigated to see what the impact is on the whole plan at some time.

Lee Duncan: I look at for instance pages 156 through 175. I have got to be honest with you, I don't see a whole lot in there that makes me feel real comfortable and one of my recommendations is going to be that we defer any recommendations on these expense projections here and 80,000 for study of scenic views and sensitive habitat? That is lot of money to go and study scenic views and sensitive habitat.

Michael Zehner: If I could suggest similar to what the CAC did on the CIP plan and I can't recall if you all did on the short term work program that you forwarded the recommendation of the projects without the funding recommendation.

I think that is what we had talked about.

Lee Duncan: That would one that I am recommending Mr. Chair.

Michael Zehner: That would be amendment #9?

Susan Maziar: Number 9.

Lee Duncan: Have you got the double digits yet?

Just a point of clarification on page 180 under level service measure. Measure of fire engines per functional population is needed. Again the number of fire engines that we are going to have is based on the number of population, I think that I missed the police one that is alright.

Lee Duncan: Again, that is part of the capitol improvement element that I am going to suggest that refer action on that is chapter 7.... It is clearly a deficient item.

Bob Wiley: On page 196, road travel needs are based on the number of people in the household. I am on the first paragraph of projection and needs and again it is all of the number of people is what were talking about in the Carter & Burgess file.

Richard Fangmann: One thing to note is with some of the transportation thing that are in here is that you cover a five year period where the comprehensive transportation thing is another element we will be looking at as we move into the 30 years is whether it is with these numbers or new numbers that reflect any differences that are examined would be a more of a flushing out of the plan beyond that 5 years into the 30 years so there is a lot transportation improvement that is beyond the 5 years that are located in this plan. One thing that maybe important to note is even if there is some transportation differences as you move further into the future that will reflect into CTP probably the work plan that is in this 5 years would still be needed and then some and we are probably not going to put much more 5 years looking at the total numbers that are there. That is just an observation.

Lee Duncan: Isn't it a true statement that when this transportation analysis was done the bulk of the analysis work was done intercity as opposed to connectivity with other communities around us. In other words what I am reading in here is the transportation studies were done in the cities of Sandy Springs period. There was not a whole lot of time put into where we might tie into Cobb County, tie into Roswell or tie into Dunwoody and with when those roads kind of come together it was more of.....

Michael Zehner: A lot of the focus was on projects that were within the city although we did take into account the movements that went from the city and went outside of the city.

Don Boyken: From in the city our outside the city?

Lee Duncan: The next question is what percentage of the vehicular traffic did Sandy Springs currently experience on a daily basis originates from outside the city of Sandy Springs?

Richard Fangmann: I would have look up the number. It would depend varying on the corridor I guess. Some of the corridors obviously have a lot more traffic going all the way through. For example, Abernathy and Johnson Ferry have.....

Lee Duncan: There is a theme song about this whole area and that is that Sandy Springs is path through when I am

going home and going to work and I am trying to determine how much validity there is to that and then we can start to really marry up the burden on our traffic corridors. Because if we are just saying that we are going add 20,000 and 30,000 people to the city and we are going to satisfy the transportation needs of those people we are missing a huge segment that are using our transportation corridors everyday if we don't start to recognize the fact that even though we don't want it to, it is going to continue and is a fact of life. We need to be in a position where those people that are coming from Cobb County to the Pill Hill area we recognize and we pick them up so that we are thinking about those areas as we are going through this process.

Richard Fangmann: That is a good comment and we did try to include some of that in the modeling and hopefully we will be looking at the more too in the CTP but....

Bob Wiley: Don has indicated that he done. Wayne do you have any comments?

Wayne Thatcher: I have got a couple of general comments and this is going to follow some of Don's comments but I think that in the ??? area this follow what you are going to talk about. I believe that generally the density in the nodes is just really insufficient if we are going to accommodate the growth that we think is there. I think 25,000 square feet an acre or 20 units an acre for residential in these nodes is insufficient. I think it ought to be and I hear Lee say maybe four times that I think it needs to enhance to three times that and that would create the high density. I think that we are fooling ourselves with what we are defining as high density here. This is not high density. I think that this basic plan will inhibit no growth because of the cost of land will just be economically feasible for maybe developers to come in (inaudible). As a basic statement that is where I am on the nodes. Secondly, if we go to the protected neighborhoods it talks limiting the infill in protective neighborhoods which I think is great and I wholeheartedly concur. But where does it address just infill in neighborhoods and we talked about a little bit because I believe in the future where we are going to have smaller lots and smaller homes and this document doesn't drive us in that direction. We have all come here with directives to maintain the neighborhoods.

Michael Zehner: If you go to page 119 there is a land use policy on assemblages for single family assemblages. It talks about when those are appropriate and it even allows enough openness and flexibility that it would allow some of this to occur in protected neighborhoods.

Wayne Thatcher: Protecting neighborhoods is a whole different subject but an ordinary subdivision and tell me where in this document will allow for smaller lots and smaller houses because that is really what we need to have .....

Michael Zehner: This policy would cover that.

Nancy Leathers: But keep in mind that there are decisions that you have to make and when we talked in the beginning and we talked about the fact that the policy that is in this plan that is represented from the committee and is recommending to you is that for protected neighborhoods that what is controlled is the size of the lots and the setbacks. To the extent that they are protected neighborhoods you would not get smaller lots just developing a little at a time in the subdivision. That is why the assemblage that Michael is talking about here is the way that you again begin to address the reassemblage and the redefinition of those neighborhoods. You do it as unit rather than just a little bit at a time.

Michael Zehner: Basically if read "A" it says while the city of Sandy Springs recognizes the importance of single family neighborhoods the city also recognizes that circumstances can may arise through economic inconsistent land use and environmental constraints that may destabilize and render neighborhoods less viable under the existing developmental potential during these times that assemblage and redevelopment of single family and residential lots and neighborhoods resulting in increase density and/or changing uses may be appropriate. It talks about the criteria for considering assemblages to be appropriate.

Wayne Thatcher: Then you go down to B5 and it talks about you can't do it unless you tie up 90% of the subdivision.

Michael Zehner: That is correct. Well if you think about let's say you have a subdivision with 20 lots or 10 lots let's say and 9 of those lots say yes we want to do this but you have one lot that is in the middle, you still have to divide public street access to that one lot that is not participating in the assemblage. Therefore, you can not basically public works has an obligation to still provide public street access so you can't see that street, you can't deed that street over to the assemblage and so there is reasons for that and we need to do this in a way that is smart and provide rights to property owners and individual property owners in these single family subdivision but also allow for flexibility for this to occur when it is necessary.

Nancy Leathers: This actually goes back to as you probably recollect in Sandy Springs there were a whole series of subdivision assemblages back in the probably the middle 1980s. They pretty much peaked out by the early 1990s but there were a whole series of subdivisions that were brought out and one of the things that you have to do when you assemble a subdivision is to make sure that you have got enough of that subdivision so that those folks who remain have the ability to remain in their homes or to do whatever and those folks who redevelop also have a viable development. The goal of doing this kind of assemblage policy is to ensure that you have enough so that you can actually do that and do it effectively. Otherwise, you have very poor land development standards and very difficult areas to maintain because you have got a list of things that really don't work very well at all. A lot of this is based on our prior experience because

we went through a whole series at least a half a dozen subdivisions assemblages during that time period.

Lee Duncan: Shouldn't that be a decision made by the buyer, a financial decision that is made by them because ultimately they are going to have to sell the property that they have assembled. Why 90%?

Nancy Leathers: This is a guideline and not an absolute but it gives some guidance on the level that you need to get to, to be able to put it an effective assemblage together. We had failed assemblages during that time period and one of the reasons that they failed is because the portion of the homes that were acquired and the location of the homes that were not acquired really levitated against an effective development. Over time the assemblages fell apart the properties went back to people, it took a long period of time for those homes to then rejuvenate and to have people move back into them. It is intended to be guidance for us as we evaluate whether it is further enough along to handle the rezoning. It is not a question of an individual owner not being able to address the zone issues but he is unable to control the area outside and what kind of policy that a public body would use in assessing whether it is ready.

Lee Duncan: This would not meet that policy. 9 times out of 10 when assemblage occurs the properties do not close until the rezoning is completed and until some level of planning is done. That is just the way that contracts are written and if for some reason it doesn't occur that allows that acquirer of the property to back away from it with literally virtually accept those expenses for putting this up.

Nancy Leathers: I not suggesting that they have to close but the contracts have to be in place at time of rezoning to be able to put together a viable development and that is really the issue that is before you here.

Lee Duncan: I don't understand why 90% is the number that should even be in there.

Nancy Leathers: We are trying to give some guidance to the level of assemblage that you have to in order to ensure that have a viable development.

Lee Duncan: I would just say a majority.

Nancy Leathers: If you wish you can do an amendment to that.

Don Boyken: Did that really answer your question at all?

Wayne Thatcher: It did not because it we are talking about infill development to accommodate the population growth in areas where we have a mandate to preserve the neighborhoods but we need to instead of building a McMansion we need to have smaller lots and the same size housing and that statement flies in the face of what you folks are coming to us on this staff.

Nancy Leathers: That is correct but what the plan comes to you with and what the committee is recommending to you is that a number of these neighborhoods not change their lot and character. They're willing to deal with larger houses but not necessarily the change of lots size as their setback. We talked about that in the very beginning so you are absolutely correct.

Susan Maziar: Can I just say something about Roswell Road? You said that community live work is probably not enough density because of land values.....

Wayne Thatcher: It prohibits development because of that.

Susan Maziar: We don't know that yet. This plan hasn't really been put into action yet and these changes haven't taken place. Regional live work or unlimited density doesn't belong on Roswell Road and it belongs in the perimeter area and the people of Sandy Springs don't want it on Roswell Road. Their vision for Roswell Road is different than unlimited heights and unlimited densities. Roswell Road can't accommodate it traffic wise. It is not going to be widened. I don't think we can afford the community live work nodes that are on the table now from a traffic standpoint.

Wayne Thatcher: Susan you are absolutely missing the point. Live work, now take these two words, live work and put a condominium along side of an office tower and they walk to work. That is my perception of what Roswell Road needs to be.

Susan Maziar: In a perfect world you live right next door to where you work but I don't know if that is reality. But let me give you an example. The Crawford rezoning that we just rezoned to community live work. 850 cars are coming out of that development.

Wayne Thatcher: Live work now if you have a savvy developer that comes in here and develops a high rise office building adjacent to a high rise condo, how many people do you think will flock to that condo because they work in the office building? (inaudible) It is going to be a slam dunk but increased densities don't allow us to do that because of the price of the land when you are paying 2 million an acre you just can't make it economically viable.

Susan Maziar: In the perimeter area we have that.

Wayne Thatcher: I am not talking about the perimeter area.

Susan Maziar: There are condos next to office buildings my point is it doesn't belong on Roswell Road. It is not even on the table the regional densities.

Wayne Thatcher: They asked me what my comments were about this. I think those high densities nodes need to be high density to accommodate and to get the cars off of the streets so we can walk to work. There is a lot of conversation about pedestrian friendly and that is one of the basic ways to do that. Have the work adjacent to live.

Lee Duncan: One of the best examples that I have seen of that and it has been done now for 25 years is Colony Square and Colony Square is a live work community. Condominiums in one tower, hotel in another tower, offices in another tower and you go down there at 5:00 at night and the preponderance of traffic you see is not from Colony Square it is from the buildings around Colony Square. You go down there at 8:00 in the morning it is the same situation. The people taking advantage of that opportunity it took awhile to get going. In the late 70s and early 80s when it come out of the ground it was not the hottest thing going but now the values on that building are skyrocketing because of what Wayne is talking about. You have that opportunity to be in good class A office space, you have comfortable place to live, you have shopping right there in the building and the conveniences are there. If you have to go to Publix's or something you have to get out and go there. You can't get that but you do all dry cleaning, you can pick up a local paper, you can go to the bookstore downstairs, health club downstairs and that is my vision of a live work community. Maybe that is on a grander scale than some of what we are dealing here in Sandy Springs but in terms of how we are meshing uses together that is how I see it coming together.

Susan Maziar: Neighborhood live work will accomplish that too. Just on a lesser scale.

Bob Wiley: Do you have any other comment Susan?

Susan Maziar: That was it.

Bob Wiley: We have one other thing I wish staff would run us through is this memo we got on our desk up here from Carter Burgess, I haven't had a chance to read this thing in its entirety if one of you will go through it and give us the implications of it please.

Richard Fangmann: This is related to one of the areas that we have tried to look a little more closely at related to some additional density from the rezoning. All we did was looked at that area 39 which is the Roswell Road corridor and the staff can find that on page 39 it is #23 revision #39. What we did was we looked at that area where as our current travel demand model analysis work that we are doing is part of the comprehensive plan is accounting for the densities that we have talked about before of population conformant. What staff asked us to do with particular case was to take a look at what if this area was to fully build out what is permitted with the zoning under the two cases of live work neighborhood and the live work community and just take a look at what those implications would be on that section of Roswell Road and we found that table 1 in its handout that really shows is the comparisons of the densities for the live work neighborhood, live work commercial and the net increase that was assumed.

Nancy Leathers: You have got a typo it says commercial.

Richard Fangmann: Oh, commercial I am sorry it should be live work community, it says it above that we made a typo in the table I am sorry. Live work neighborhood and live work community and then the net increase there so basically that area has been 119 acres and the increase in the residential density would go from 5 units per acre to about 20 units per acre for an increase of 15 units and the residential would go for about a little under 600 to about 2,400 units so that is an increase of almost 1,800 units of the residential.

Bob Wiley: So this is in 23 years?
Richard Fangmann: This would be (inaudible) if it were to build out in 23 years but yes we did look at this with the traffic in the year 2030 so the other traffic was near 2030 traffic based on the comp plan within this assumed to be build out by that time so we are looking at. That is in the future with area fully built out. What we have found there is that we are looking at some increases in the traffic volume. There a lot of differences in developments between live work community and live work neighborhood and we are getting so more efficiency in use because of some of those things like the mixed uses and also probably some the surrounding area which is trying to designate any longer distances on the road to satisfy some of their retail trips or able some of those retail and commercial with a shorter trip lengths. We are showing an increase overall in the amount of traffic generated on that roadway but not as much as you think you might get with such a large increase and that is part of the idea of having mixture of uses and how that works within the community. What this is showing is we have got about 30,000 cars per day on that road today which sort of corresponds to what we call level service B, if you are familiar with those terms almost sort of that grading scale you don't want to get a D in school but you consider D to be expectable in the traffic world. What that means is that you haven't really had those times where you have.... Most cars clear every cycle of the signal. Most folks don't have any large delays in trying to get out and ?? and go beyond one intersection to the next. When you get to sort of this live work 20/30 condition of the live work

neighborhood what we call level service E which is sort of beyond the D not the total failure yet but we are starting to have that time. Those are the situations where you wait 2 or 3 cycles maybe to get through your critical intersection but overall your travels are not too bad. Then we are getting level service F with the live work community. We sort of crept over that edge but one thing that is important to note is that there is a lot of places even within Sandy Springs where we have some level F along certain corridors and certainly within metro Atlanta. But that is something that has occurred when you get to there with that additional density we are capturing a lot of the trips but we are still kind of creeping over that threshold.

Bob Wiley: This analysis assumes that there are no improvements on the road as they are now?

Richard Fangmann: Right, this assumes a current four lane road with just the assumptions of some intersection improvements and one way to handle it, you know with the six lane road you would be getting an additional measure of capacity which would take you beyond that 45,000 demand probably to 56,000 or so vehicles per day that you could serve on the road if it was to be widened for example. However, you would also, that way would be more attractive too and you would draw more traffic to that road also. We haven't really run that specific but that would be something we could look as we drill down more. If that is a viable option that the community wants to pursue concerning widening, but we are really trying to avoid considering those widenings.

Bob Wiley: So what you are really saying is that we should go back and change #39 from live work community to living working neighborhood.

Richard Fangmann: I am just saying this is sort of the traffic implications of not doing that and that doesn't necessarily mean that....

Mark Moore: (inaudible) I would advise you on land use...

I would like to make that amendment to 10. This does represent sort of the worst case scenario where you calculated some of the efficiencies of the land use which would imply certain changes like closing some curb cuts, some interparcel connectivity but this is without any sort of systemic transportation improvements like you have in the town center that are already in the plan and at the 400% build out based on the surface area that you are talking so. If you heard the six lane comment, before anybody gets nervous that was literally a what if and I believe the computer stimulation is still running which is why we don't have those numbers because we start doing that and it takes 24 to 48 hours literally to run the relations. But we did have a what if that came out of conversation sort of on the staff level of consultants that we would be interested in seeing just what it would be for intellectual curiosity.

Bob Wiley: I assume that you could get the city of Atlanta to increase...

Mark Moore: That would assume a massive amount of things that are well outside of the scope but that I didn't want anybody to get nervous that anybody had any intention to that other than that of intellectual study.

Wayne Thatcher: Can we comment or ask questions or..... is there anybody in any of these studies concerned the fact that people are going to change and that fewer cost are going to drive people to make decisions about where they live and where they work. I have got two people in my office that coming to be talking about buying mopeds because they are going to live within two miles of the office because of the cost of fuel and I don't think that is unique because we talked to the moped dealer and he says that my business has increased 8,000% in six months. They do it all over Europe it is eventually coming here and it is coming here in a big way and that is going to change a lot of the traffic patterns. The question is this based on more people with the same kind of driving patterns that they have now?

Richard Fangmann: The model in our process for looking at this does not take into less driving for things like the fuel cost which I know that is an issue which has come quite a bit in recent discussions with us but one thing that it does take into account is as the area grows and densifies the metro Atlanta area overall you are going to have more friction on the roadway system so people are going to tend to try to live closer to where they work so it does sort of takes into account as traffic congestion increases people tend to take that shorter route so there is less overall trip making.

Susan Maziar: I had one more I didn't know that we were including the map changes. #34.
With these amendments I thought that we were doing that.

Bob Wiley: You can bring now or you can bring it up later on.

Susan Maziar: What number amendment are we on? Number 11 would be discussing on the land use map #34. The regional live work color should not extend to Sherrill Colton Crawford property the town homes under construction and singular office building.

Sherrill Colton is a viable neighborhood. Crawford rezoning that we just had and we made it community.

Michael Zehner: You don't want it to touch Glenridge basically.

Susan Maziar: I don't want the regional to touch Glenridge so Sherrill Colton, the Crawford property, the town homes under construction and the singular office building.

Michael Zehner: Susan is it that you would like to return it back to what it presently is if you turn around and look at the map?

Susan Maziar: I would like it to return back to what is on the ground.

Nancy Leathers: Would you look at the plan and see whether that is consistent or if we need to make some other change to it?

Michael Zehner: That is the existing map.

Vann McNeil: The one to the right of that one.
Susan Maziar: Crawford is on the map for community live work so that is okay.

Nancy Leathers: So all for those that are on that map that is what is your motion?

Susan Maziar: Right, the next three aren't okay, Sherrill Colton, actually they are on the map for t2 to 3 so return it to that.

Nancy Leathers: That is my point if we go the interim land use map and show those, your motion is to return to those properties to that map.

Susan Maziar: Just those two, there is two that I don't want returned to that map. That is the Madison town homes are being 8.9 units to the acre and I think they should be reflected on the plan as so which would be 8 to 12 units to the acre. The singular office building should return to what it was 12 months ago which is office. Two yes and two no.

Nancy Leathers: I think that I understand the motion.

Lee Duncan: I am completely lost is this the area here (inaudible not talking into mike).

(Inaudible) Board members not talking into mike.

Bob Wiley: Does anybody else on the Commission have any questions or can we proceed to vote?

Lee Duncan: Did my motion get on there regarding the capitol improvements area?

Regarding endorsing the funding? Yes it is in there.

Lee Duncan: The transportation priorities that are listed in here I just don't feel comfortable making a recommendation on that right now Mr. Vice Chair.

Vann McNeil: They are not prioritized.

Mark Moore: The search and work program as to projects that are feasible in the next five years that facilitate the plans, goals and bad policies but they are not prioritized within themselves.

Bob Wiley: Would someone like to make a motion that we…

Wayne Thatcher: I will make a motion that we accept the plan.

Bob Wiley: Is there a second?

Lee Duncan: seconded.

Bob Wiley: Motion is made and seconded.

Michael Zehner: Do I hear any other motion to approve the plan?

With transmission to the City Council?

With the amendments.

Michael Zehner: No.

You can't approve it and then amended it. You have to amend it then it will go forth.

Michael Zehner: You have made a motion to approve and then there has been a seconded and now you can have discussion and vote on each individual amendment. Then you will make a vote on the main.

Bob Wiley: Vann will read the amendments that we have proposed and Vann will you give us the page numbers so that we can follow?

Vann McNeil: Patrice will you help me?

Patrice Ruffin: Turn to page 92 and 93.

Vann McNeil: It was essentially and we have to work on the language. Commissioner expressed a desire to see if there were more positive incentives for affordable housing a more defined definition of what those incentives are, I believe? Did I get that close? It will take some wordsmithing to kind of make.....

Lee Duncan: I would like to add into that, I just feel like this whole document really doesn't speak to encouraging a lot of population growth here. I really want that included in there some where. I want to see more young faces walking around Sandy Springs and I want them happy and living here and working here. With all due respect to the aging population that we have here.

Bob Wiley: What you are saying really is that you would like the staff to work this thing in accordance with your wishes?

Lee Duncan: Get more young chicks.

Vann McNeil: I made the note.

Are you trying to move Buckhead up here?

Bob Wiley: Rather than but the exact words you are allowing staff to take...

Lee Duncan: Or maybe make that separate item Bob, item #13 or something like that in that paragraph. Or in the one below it providing housing affordability either one but I just something that we are avoiding, not intentionally, we are just avoiding it.

Bob Wiley: Vann do you understand the implication of what he is saying?

Vann McNeil: I made note of the additional language that you wanted to add.

Michael Zehner: You have to have a second.

Wayne Thatcher: I seconded.

Bob Wiley: The move has been seconded to approve that all those in favor say aye?

Aye. (5-0) approved.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed?

Vann McNeil: Amendment #2 was from page 99. Related to water quality and the amendment were to add sidewalks after parking lots.

Bob Wiley: Do I hear a motion?
Don Boyken: I move.

Susan Maziar: I second.

Bob Wiley: The motion has been made and seconded to add sidewalks?

Aye. (5-0) approved.

Vann McNeil: I believe #3 was page 98 #13, delete the last sentence. To discontinue the piping ....

Bob Wiley: On #13 that is correct.

Don Boyken: That is my motion.

Lee Duncan: I will second that motion.

Bob Wiley: The motion has been made and seconded to delete the second line in paragraph 13, all those in favor say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed?

Bob Wiley: No I am opposed. (4-1)

Vann McNeil: Amendment #4 page 101 #3

Michael Zehner: Under redevelopment policies?

Vann McNeil: Yes. Can you read that one?

Nancy Leathers: It should read provide incentives or bonuses for the redevelopment of Roswell Road commercial areas along the Roswell Road corridor.

Bob Wiley: Do I hear a motion?

Wayne Thatcher: I move.

Lee Duncan: Second.

Bob Wiley: Motion is made and seconded.

Aye. (5-0)

Bob Wiley: All those opposed?

Vann McNeil: Page 109 #2

Wayne Thatcher: To eliminate which match identified housing needs should be taken out.

Vann McNeil: No market analysis every time a project is submitted.

Lee Duncan: Just delete what Bob said which match identified housing needs.
Bob Wiley: Do I hear a motion?

Lee Duncan: I move.

Bob Wiley: Is there a second?

Susan Maziar: second.

Bob Wiley: Motion has been made and seconded, all those in favor say aye?

Aye. (5-0).

Vann McNeil: #6, page 111, there was a question about high density should have more green space. We need to decide on I would assume something that will reflect open versus green space.

Michael Zehner: Basically we would be making an addition that green space be incorporated with open space through out the living working nodes.

Bob Wiley: Vann I have that as #7 did you miss 6?

Vann McNeil: I have 37 as being adding open and green space language to all nodes.

What about adding 6E?

Michael Zehner: That was not a needed change in that it was the intent of the CAC that be done so that was a typographical omission?

That is not an amendment?

Michael Zehner: No. It would be a 6E addition it does not need to be an amendment.

Amendment 7 is to better outline….amendment 6 would be throughout the living work node to strike I believe.

Patrice Ruffin: #6 was to clarify the amount of open space versus the green space. #7 was the live work node that include,

Vann McNeil: What ever we did in #6 to include in #7.

Susan Maziar: I got it.

Michael Zehner: What I was trying to get at is Commissioner Maziar I think wanted open space deleted and be solely green space, amendment 6.

Susan Maziar: 6 should address town center node and Roswell Road and I-285 node because those folks have 15%, the other nodes all have 10%, and can we split it up that way?

Michael Zehner: I think that the point of confusion is that you wanted to revisit this point at this time so I think you need to…

Susan Maziar: I suggested that we take out open space and define green space. I see both sides I do but I did think that when you buy an acre of land that means that you can maximize the entire acre.

Michael Zehner: Green space is defined on page 211.

Wayne Thatcher: I thought that we were going to change that land use to..

Michael Zehner: Open space is defined on page 214.

Bob Wiley: I believe 15% of the site should be maintained as open and then green space. Open and green space and that is the statement that we are going to have in every one of these nodes.

Susan Maziar: But I am afraid if we put that way….

Bob Wiley: I know that it is not what you want but that is what we agreed on.

Susan Maziar: I am afraid if we do open and green space that we will only get open space which is impervious surface.

Bob Wiley: That is not going to fly Susan.

Susan Maziar: So let's talk about it.

Bob Wiley: I just told you what we got to do.

Michael Zehner: Do you want to go and make a motion and see if there is a second and then discuss what your motion is?

Susan Maziar: Okay, my motion would be for the first two nodes were at 15% that we use the language open and green space of which 10% has to be green space. Just for those first two nodes because their percentage is 15%. Open and green space 10% green space.

Michael Zehner: Basically there should 15% open space 10% of which … you are right I know what you are saying.

Bob Wiley: That there be 10% green space and 5% open or green space.

Susan Maziar: I don't think that it is a huge concession when you are extensity.

Bob Wiley: Are you making a motion that it be 10% and 5% open or green.

Susan Maziar: This is just for the first two nodes. The town center and …

Michael Zehner: And I-285 Roswell Road node. Is there a second?

Bob Wiley: I second. The motion has been made and seconded. To change the two nodes from what it reads to be 10% green space plus 5% open and/or green space. All those in favor please say Aye?

Lee Duncan: Can we have some discussion on this?

Bob Wiley: I thought we just did.

Lee Duncan: We just discussion on what the amendment is.

Bob Wiley: Discuss Lee.

Lee Duncan: I think that the first thing that we ought to do is go to the glossary and look up what green space is before we start voting on this thing. That is on page 214 for green space. The term open space refers to the portion of the property not occupied by buildings or parking, drive isles or other similar elements dedicated to use that does not allow for pedestrian or congregation. It is getting exactly done what you are trying to get done in terms you are saying the whole area is going to be a parking lot. What they are saying they are eliminating not occupied by buildings, parking, drive isles and other similar elements dedicated to use that does not allow for pedestrian access or congregation. Furthermore while open space does include those areas incorporated green space, open space is intended to account for areas that may be and encourage pedestrian activity in congregation such as plazas, fountains, courtyards and similar features.

Susan Maziar: I am afraid if we don't require we won't get it and I find it incredible that we don't want that for our town center.

Lee Duncan: We are not saying that we don't want it, we are saying that if you have a 20 acre site to set aside 15% of that…..

Susan Maziar: 10%.

Lee Duncan: You are setting aside 15% with open and green space.

Susan Maziar: It was staff's recommendation to set aside….

Lee Duncan: Plus buffers and everything else…..

Susan Maziar: No, it includes buffers, it includes …. Green space.

Essentially if you do your math you have 3 acres.

Susan Maziar: The term green space refers to the portions of a property remaining or resulting as vegetated areas comprised largely of natural materials. It includes buffers, landscape strips, landscape islands, those are not even concessions those are requirements. Park wooded areas ..

Lee Duncan: If Sandy Springs wants 15%, if they want 25% let them go buy that land from the developer because essentially what you have done is that you have created a taking.

Susan Maziar: I disagree with you. When I buy an acre of land I don't have the right to maximize it to all four corners with density.

Lee Duncan: When you buy an acre of land and you build a house you don't have me coming in there and telling you to put 20% of aside in the gardens.

Susan Maziar: But I have setbacks and…green space.

Lee Duncan: You might have setbacks and trees and all of that is part of this but you don't set a minimum percentage of that is being set aside for a specific use and what you are telling a man who is buying this land or a company and investing a lot of money, these properties are not inexpensive. When they get ready to buy these properties this is going to be a huge investment and it could well be approaching a million dollars an acre or two million dollars an acre which ever it is.

Susan Maziar: We are also allowing huge amounts of density.

Lee Duncan: These are not huge amounts of density, 20 units to an acre, 25,000 square feet to an acre that is not density.
Susan Maziar: Let me reword that we are allowing a huge increase in density to what on the ground today. What is wrong with wanting it to be green?

Lee Duncan: Do you really want the area to be developed or not?

Susan Maziar: We will vote. Yes I want the area developed but I want it developed properly.

Lee Duncan: Then my recommendation is you go buy the land for two million and you figure out how to make it work with these densities and the other stipulations that you are putting on there because it just won't work.

Bob Wiley: Is there any further discussion on this item #6? Let's take a vote.

Susan Maziar: I find it incredulous that we would create new land use categories and go up in height and not set aside any land to be left green.

Don Boyken: That is a misrepresentation of what this plan says. It says it is 15% of green space and open space. It does not say that you are not getting any green space and your statements to that are wrong.

Susan Maziar: I am saying that a developer could make all open space rather than green.

Don Boyken: Look at the plazas in Europe there is lots of plazas in Europe that don't have any green space at all but they are some of the nicest plazas that you are going to find in central cities.

Susan Maziar: I have a right to my opinion.

Don Boyken: That is true.

Bob Wiley: Is there any further discussion? All those in favor of Susan's amendment to 10% green plus 5% open or green please say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed?

Opposed. (2-3) Susan and Bob for.

Bob Wiley: Motion has failed and it stays as it is.

Don Boyken: Let's talk about it though. We are moving from 10% to 15% we want to move from 10 to 15% of open and green space on those first two nodes is that correct?

Bob Wiley: Page 111 and

Susan Maziar: Page 12 3A, it is already at 15.

On those first two it is recommended to be 15. Now the piece that Susan caught and I agree with is that we are silent about green space or open space in the balance of the items. That is where we need to have an amendment.

Let's go to 144 and go down to 3A, the last sentence.

Bob Wiley: That is item #7.

Susan Maziar: What happened to 6 are we done with it?

Michael Zehner: 6 failed.

So the next one is #7.

Michael Zehner: Item #7 is to insert green space along with open space in the remainder of the live work nodes.

Susan Maziar: Actually I wanted open and green but defined green.

Michael Zehner: It is defined in the glossary.

Susan Maziar: It is going to fail that is my desire.

Michael Zehner: Motion 7 was to insert green space along with open space, if you want to take a different motion....

Bob Wiley: No, we are on discussion point and we have not made a motion on it yet.

Lee Duncan: By definition open space includes green space.

Susan Maziar: You are right open space includes green but open doesn't have to be green. Let's define that 10% that has to be green.

Lee Duncan: How would you handle a detention pond?

Susan Maziar: That is not for Susan to answer that is for staff to answer.

Lee Duncan: I mean if we are changing it and we are looking at this I guess what we ought to be thinking is what will have if there is a lake on the property?

Susan Maziar: That would probably and my guess would be that is open space, a lake is not green.

Wayne Thatcher: What is a water feature, is that green or ..

Michael Zehner: I would consider a lake is open space.

Wayne Thatcher: How about a water feature, if it gets to be built in the plaza…

Michael Zehner: I would consider that open space.

Bob Wiley: Susan do you want to make a motion?

Susan Maziar: I move that for good balance I think there is nine nodes, that require 10% that it should say, how did we word that last one? 10% green space of which 5% can be open space?

Michael Zehner: Open or green space.

You basically wanted two-thirds of the set aside in the last one to be green space? What percentage would like on the….

Susan Maziar: So you would that the node should be 5% green space and 5% open space, or open or green space. 5% green space, 5% open or green space.

Michael Zehner: That would apply to the remainder of the living working…..

Susan Maziar: Those nine nodes. That was my motion.

Bob Wiley: I will second it. Is there any discussion?

Lee Duncan: Would you consider allowing water features such as lakes to be included in computation for green space?

Bob Wiley: That would have to change the definition then.

Lee Duncan: I understand that.

That could possibly be taken care of at the time of zoning on a special case basis?

Bob Wiley: We have a motion and a second, no more discussion, all those in favor of the motion please say Aye.

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed?

Opposed.

Bob Wiley: Motion passes. (3-2) Don and Lee against.

Vann McNeil: #8, page 136 policy 11 was to delete.

Bob Wiley: To delete #11 talks about adding additional bridge crossing the Chattahoochee River was recommended by the CAC but it was inserted into the booklet but nobody will fess up to it?

Do you want to include in your motion that policy #12 should be relabeled as policy 11?

Bob Wiley: That will be handled if they do it. Any discussion? Do I have a motion?

Don Boyken: So move.

Susan Maziar: Second.

Bob Wiley: Any discussion on it, all those in favor of the motion please say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed? Motion passes. (5-0).

Vann McNeil: Amendment #9 was covering the areas in the document 156 to 176 is a short term work program it involved sending projects forward without concurrence with the dollar figures that were associated with those projects.

Don Boyken: So moved.

Bob Wiley: Do we have a second?
Lee Duncan: Second.

Bob Wiley: Any discussion, all those in favor of the motion please say Aye, all those opposed?
Motion passes. (5-0)

Vann McNeil: Page 36 shows area 39, page 39 in the table it is #23 is revision #39, it is to reverse the recommendation and return the area to live work neighborhood from live work community.

Bob Wiley: Do I hear a motion?

Susan Maziar: I move.

Wayne Thatcher: I second.

Bob Wiley: Any discussion?

What would the committee (inaudible) when this was recommended Bob?

Vann McNeil: There was a lot of debate between the development real estate community and the neighbors.

Bob Wiley: It was pretty much half and half one way or the other but we did not have the benefit of the transportation impact on it.

Lee Duncan: If the transportation thing would have come in much more positive do you think?

Michael Zehner: I think that the question was what it would take to get redevelopment in this area and what kind of level of density and development and that was kind of the push for it I believe.

Bob Wiley: Any further discussion.

Lee Duncan: I am in favor of the motion but I am just going to throw out a huge word of caution which is the property values in that area have absolutely sky rocketed and I think that we are going to be seeing this again in the form of a rezoning that is probably going to be very annoying to the neighborhood down there but in order to make the numbers work that is meant to be developed pretty high density.

Susan Maziar: I move to change to live work neighborhood and somebody seconded it.

Wayne Thatcher: Seconded.

Bob Wiley: All those in favor of changing #39 from live work community to live work neighborhood please say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed? Passed. (5-0)

Vann McNeil: The last one sir amendment #11 which also be the map on page 36 and the table on page 39 it is revision #34, #20 is soon on the table and I would love to recite the boundaries but I know that Nancy has it so if you all are comfortable with that Commissioner if you would like to, I wrote it down but…

Michael Zehner: It was to basically resend the living working regional designation applied in that area and to return the Crawford property to living working community and designate the town home property to 8 to 12 units per acre, designated the singular property as office and to remove the living working regional designation from Colton and Sherrill.

Susan Maziar: That will go back what it is 2 to 3?

Michael Zehner: Yes with the other changes noted to the Crawford, town home and singular property.

Bob Wiley: Susan is that your motion?

Susan Maziar: Yes.

Bob Wiley: Do I have a second.

Wayne Thatcher: I am going to second it.

Bob Wiley: Any further discussion? All those in favor of the motion say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed? (5-0)

Michael Zehner: You have the main motion as amended…

Lee Duncan: No, this originated with Don now where as it we want to send a very strong statement to the City Council about our concerns about the basic premise for the population projections and does that need to be handled in a vote form because we want to continue this discussion in terms of not only the land plan but the comprehensive transportation plan that reflects these numbers as well as the financial model that reflects these numbers.

Michael Zehner: I think that the main motion that you have taken is with that intent and that would be directed to the Mayor and City Council.

Lee Duncan: I would like to say let's take a vote and let them know how we feel about it and…

Bob Wiley: This would be in the form of a cover letter?

Michael Zehner: Yes.

Lee Duncan: That way you can make a statement of it was a unanimous vote or by a vote of 3 to 2 or whatever it is Bob.

Bob Wiley: Is everyone clear about the intent of the cover letter with Lee's input on it?

Don Boyken: I will make the motion that it happened.

Lee Duncan: I will second the motion.

Susan Maziar: Will we see a copy of it?

Bob Wiley: Sense this is fairly political I would suggest that you draft it up and forward it to, all seven of us?

Michael Zehner: We may not have a good deal of time the work session is Tuesday and staff understands your intent there is serious concern from the Planning Commissioner regarding., It is going to be in the form of a cover memo on top of the comprehensive plan that we submit to the Mayor and City Council and in it staff will indicate what the Planning Commission's intent was.

Don Boyken: Will you send us a copy?

Michael Zehner: We will.

Lee Duncan: If we vote to sign, we are telling staff this is what we want to have sent, so as far stopping to have somebody sign they don't need to sign it but I would like to see it first.

Michael Zehner: We may not have the opportunity to get everyone's blessing on it before we send it that is why I am going to read exactly what will say right now. Staff is forwarding this document on to the Mayor and City Council that the Planning Commission approved the document with the reconsideration or with the request that the Mayor and City Council strongly consider reviewing and possibly revising population employment, figures and transportation improvements and planning associated with those figures and they are significantly

Lee Duncan: But beyond that my motion would be building a financial model because I want to see some level of expectation for revenues, tax revenues whatever it might be and expenditures for providing services to support those growth nodes and those other areas that we are talking about adding the 21,000 people to. How many more policemen are we have to hire and how we are going to pay for them? How many more public work staff are we going to have to hire and where are going to put them and where there offices are going to be and how we are going to pay for those, and we don't know that yet and that is just part of a planning process in my mind.

Bob Wiley: There is no time limit on that though. We have a motion, all those in favor of the motion as Michael read it and Lee amended it say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All those opposed? Unanimous. (5-0)

Michael Zehner: There was a motion and second on the main as amended by the previous votes.

Bob Wiley: We have a motion to forward this package to City Council with the 11 amendments and the cover letter, it has been seconded, any discussion on it? All those in favor please say Aye?

Aye.

Bob Wiley: All opposed? (5-0). Any further business coming before the Planning Commission?

Lee Duncan: Do we need to send anybody to the City Council meetings with this?

Susan Maziar: The chief City Council people are here.

Michael Zehner: We can get back to you on that. We will have our representative at the 19th at the meeting on the 19th from the CA so we may find that it may be relevant to have someone from the Planning Commission.

I think we agreed that you were going to send me your study of the densities that are already in this land use plan? The numbers you said you had them but you did not have them with you?

Michael Zehner: I can do that.

Vann McNeil: One final question, kind of very much after the fact and I know perhaps you may remember and I know the Chairman also Commissioner Rupnow and probably remembers it but the consultant prepared a memo listing eight reasons as to why he selected the way that he calculated the population if you would like to see it I will e-mail it to you.

Bob Wiley: That would be good.

Vann McNeil: I didn't realize that this would become such an issue of concern.

Don Boyken: It has always been an issue.

Bob Wiley: Meeting adjourned.

Meeting Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Approval Signatures	
Date Approved	
----------, Chairman	
Michael Zehner, Assistant Director Planning & Zoning	Verbatim no signature required
Bridgette Gray, Administrative Assistant/Transcriber	