March 17, 2011

As adopted by the City of Doraville on March 21, 2011

Prepared by:
Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates
Keck & Wood, Inc.
Arnett Mudrow & Associates
Mayor and City Council
Donna Pittman, Acting Mayor
Marie Alexander, Council Member
Brian Bates, Council Member
Pam Fleming, Council Member
Karen Pachuta, Council Member
Bob Roche, Council Member

Project Management Team
Luke Howe
City of Doraville Project Manager

Caleb Racicot
Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates Project Manager
Table of Contents

Part 1: Introduction
1.1 Overview .......................................................................................................................... 3
   Regional Context ..................................................................................................................... 4
   Study Area Boundaries ......................................................................................................... 4

Part 2: Inventory and Analysis
2.1 Overview of Inventory & Analysis .................................................................................. 9
   Organization of Findings ....................................................................................................... 9
   Key Findings .......................................................................................................................... 9
2.2 Land Use ........................................................................................................................ 11
   Land Use ............................................................................................................................. 11
   Future Land Use Plan ......................................................................................................... 14
   Zoning .................................................................................................................................. 16
   Environmental Factors ........................................................................................................ 19
2.3 Transportation .................................................................................................................. 22
   Traffic Systems .................................................................................................................... 23
   Pedestrian Facilities .............................................................................................................. 30
   Bicycle Facilities ................................................................................................................. 33
   Public Transportation ........................................................................................................... 35
2.4 Markets & Economics ...................................................................................................... 38
   Market Areas ......................................................................................................................... 38
   Demographics ....................................................................................................................... 39
   Retail Market ......................................................................................................................... 42
   Housing Market .................................................................................................................... 46
   Employment Trends ............................................................................................................. 49
   Land Values .......................................................................................................................... 52
   Urban Design ........................................................................................................................ 54
   Historic Resources ............................................................................................................... 58
2.6 Public Facilities & Spaces .............................................................................................. 59
   Public Facilities ..................................................................................................................... 59
2.7 Lifelong Communities ...................................................................................................... 62

Part 3: Public Process
3.1 Public Process .................................................................................................................. 67
   Interviews and Surveys ......................................................................................................... 67
   The Core Team ...................................................................................................................... 67
   Public Meetings ..................................................................................................................... 69
   Other Meetings and Presentations ......................................................................................... 70
   Communication Tools .......................................................................................................... 70
3.2 Image Preference Survey ............................................................................................... 71

Part 4: Recommendations
4.1 Overview of Recommendations ..................................................................................... 79
   Future Vision ........................................................................................................................ 79
4.2 Land Use Recommendations .......................................................................................... 82
   Land Use Policies ................................................................................................................ 82
GM Redevelopment Policies ................................................................................................................................ 86
Land Use Projects .............................................................................................................................................. 93
Environmental Policies ..................................................................................................................................... 96
Environmental Projects ..................................................................................................................................... 97

4.3 Transportation ................................................................................................................................................ 98
General Transportation Policies ....................................................................................................................... 98
Vehicular Transportation Projects ...................................................................................................................... 99
Pedestrian and Bicycle Policies .......................................................................................................................... 106
Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects ......................................................................................................................... 107
Transit Policies .................................................................................................................................................. 112
Transit Projects ................................................................................................................................................ 114

4.4 Markets & Economics ..................................................................................................................................... 115
Market & Economic Policies ............................................................................................................................... 115
Market & Economic Development Projects ........................................................................................................ 117

4.5 Urban Design & Historic Resources ............................................................................................................. 124
Urban Design & Historic Resource Policies ....................................................................................................... 124
Urban Design & Historic Resource Projects ....................................................................................................... 125

4.6 Public Facilities & Spaces ................................................................................................................................ 128
Public Facilities Projects .................................................................................................................................... 129
Public Space Projects ........................................................................................................................................ 130

Part 5: Implementation
5.1 Action Plan ...................................................................................................................................................... 135
Steps Toward Implementation ............................................................................................................................. 136
Other Project Matrix .......................................................................................................................................... 143

5.2 Zoning and Land Use Changes ..................................................................................................................... 145
5.3 Population and Employment Changes ........................................................................................................... 146
5.5 Consistency with LCI Goals .......................................................................................................................... 148
5.5 Lifelong Communities ................................................................................................................................... 150
Part 1: Introduction

March 17, 2011
1.1 Overview

The Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program is intended to promote greater livability, mobility and development alternatives in existing corridors, employment centers, and town centers. The rationale behind the program is that directing development towards areas with existing infrastructure will benefit the region and minimize sprawling land use patterns. Minimizing sprawl, in turn, will potentially reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled and the air pollution associated with those miles. Thus, the LCI program is a vehicle whereby the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) can attempt to direct mixed-use and mixed-income development towards existing infrastructure by providing study and implementation dollars.

In this context, and in light of the recent closure of the General Motors (GM) Doraville Assembly, the City of Doraville embarked on this planning effort to establish a long-term vision for its greater downtown area. Central to this was establishing a plan that would improve connectivity between various parts of the study area, encourage market-viable and pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development, promote increased density to support transit and a vibrant community center, maintain local diversity, ensure multiple transportation options, and support economic growth and a high quality of life. Its goal was to assist the community in defining their vision of how the study area (and the former GM site in particular) should redevelop, and then create a plan that uses transportation improvements, land use policies, and sound urban design to ensure that such development benefits Doraville and nearby communities. Previous failures of large-scale redevelopments in metropolitan Atlanta to achieve similar goals have highlighted the need to establish a proactive long-term vision for the area. By recognizing existing challenges and building upon opportunities, the plan is intended to be a guide for positive change that both benefits the immediate area, the residents of Doraville, and the greater community.

The goals of the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI Study, as established by the requirements of the LCI program, were to:

- Encourage a diversity of medium to high-density, mixed-income neighborhoods, employment, shopping and recreation choices at the activity and town center level.
- Provide access to a range of travel modes, including transit, roadways, walking and biking to enable access to all uses within the study area.
- Through transportation investments, increase the desirability of redevelopment of land served by existing infrastructure at activity and town centers.
- Preserve the historic characteristics of activity and town centers and create a community identity.
• Develop a community-based transportation investment program at activity and town center levels that will identify capital projects, which can be funded in the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

• Provide transportation infrastructure incentives for jurisdictions to take local actions to implement the resulting activity or town center study goals.

• Provide for the implementation of the Regional Development Plan (RDP) policies, quality growth initiatives and Best Development Practices in the study area, both through local governments and at the regional level.

• Develop a local planning outreach process that promotes the involvement of all stakeholders particularly low income, minority and traditionally under-served populations.

• Provide planning funds for development of activity and town centers that showcase the integration of land use policy and regulation and transportation investments with urban design tools.

Regional Context

The study area is located just west of the intersection of I-285 and I-85 in northeast DeKalb County, approximately 14 miles northeast of downtown Atlanta. DeKalb County grew during the first major wave of post World War II suburban development in the Atlanta region, engulfing once-isolated towns and cities with shopping centers, housing, and employment facilities in the process. Doraville was no exception, with the GM plant and planned subdivisions, including the Northwoods neighborhood, developed during this time. As such, the area today faces redevelopment challenges common to many first-ring suburbs both in the region and across the nation.

Study Area Boundaries

The study area is roughly bounded by Peachtree Boulevard to the north, I-285 to the east, Buford Highway to the south, and Shallowford Road/North Peachtree Road to the west. It includes the traditional downtown of Doraville, commercial areas along Peachtree Boulevard and Buford Highway, the former GM plant, and an industrial area along North Peachtree Road.

Approximately 689 acres of land are included in the study area, three-fourths of which lies in the City of Doraville. The remainder of land was recently annexed into the Chamblee city limits.

Please see Figure 1.1 for more details on specific study area boundaries.
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Figure 1.1: Study Area Map

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.
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2.1 Overview of Inventory & Analysis

No planning process on the scale of the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI Study can be successful without first establishing a clear understanding of existing conditions in the study area. All communities, whether urban, suburban, or rural, have existing opportunities and challenges that must be considered in the planning process. To do otherwise is to risk preparing a plan that fails to adequately reflect what makes a place unique.

Organization of Findings

During the planning process, an extensive inventory and analysis of existing conditions were performed via field work, data review, and interviews. These findings are provided in this part of the document by functional topic:

- **Land Use**: Reviews existing land uses, land use policies, zoning, and environmental factors,
- **Transportation**: Includes vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities,
- **Markets & Economics**: Summarizes demographic and employment trends, market conditions, and projected future demand,
- **Urban Design & Historic Resources**: Includes the area’s design character, aesthetics, and historic resources, and
- **Public Facilities & Spaces**: Reviews community facilities like schools, public safety, and open spaces.

For each section, existing conditions are summarized in text, charts, maps, and photos. Complex topics also review current best practices and trends. All topics include a review of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, often called a “SWOT analysis.”

Key Findings

The findings of the inventory and analysis demonstrate that the study area offers an opportunity for greater Doraville to proactively plan for a better future. An alignment of local and regional forces, including available land, demographics, market trends, environmental awareness, interest in walkable communities, public policies, and a desire for a “sense of place” all suggest that the area could be a model for suburban redevelopment in the twenty-first century.

Among the key findings are that:

- The large amount of under-utilized land is an opportunity to plan for thoughtful redevelopment.
- Transportation facilities are unbalanced and largely auto-oriented; traffic congestion is a liability.
- The closing of GM removed many good jobs from the community; redevelopment should replace them.
• Redevelopment of the GM site is a long-term prospect that, even in the best market conditions, could take decades to complete.

• Proximity to I-285, MARTA, DeKalb Peachtree Airport, and a location on the region’s north side could be capitalized on to support a major redevelopment opportunity, possible incorporating transit-oriented development (TOD) principles.

• The area is one of the most diverse in the region, and has become a center for Asian and Hispanic businesses.

• Despite a large number of ethnic businesses, the area lacks the population density necessary to attract the “mainstream” businesses that many residents also desire.

• Redevelopment will have to draw users from outside of the immediate area to justify retail and housing growth.

• The northeast Atlanta region lacks a major walkable, mixed-use center. Nationally, such centers are more resilient to market fluctuation and increasingly support economic development.

• Vertical mixed-use development will be difficult to finance in the short-term, but horizontal mixed-use is viable today.

• While short-term prospects for housing, retail, and office space may be weak, the Atlanta region will continued to grow over the next 30 years, and much of this growth will be in the form of redevelopment near existing transit stations.

• Doraville lacks a focal point. While its traditional core once served this role, it has been obliterated over several decades.

• The area lacks a positive “sense of place.”

• An aging population increasingly demands places that are compact, connected, and walkable, and that offer close-at-hand retail and services, healthy living, and opportunities for socializing.

• Doraville has successfully provided single-family housing, but lacks quality alternatives, such as townhouses, condominiums, and above-shop lofts. These and other options are needed to serve the aging population.

• The study area offers an opportunity for growth that does not encroach into existing residential areas.

Most important, however, is the finding that change in the study area is inevitable. Many of its buildings are nearing the end of their useful lives, leaving the community with three possible choices: abandonment; redevelopment into more of the same; or redevelopment into something new. While existing zoning entitlements allow most of the study area to develop according to the single-use, auto-oriented, and disconnected land use model that has marked growth in the Atlanta region for the past 50 years, it doesn’t have to be this way. The choice for its future is not between “change” and “no change.” Rather, the type of change that is most appropriate for the long-term vitality of the study area, its vicinity, and the region must be determined.
2.2 Land Use

Land Use

Land uses and the relationship between them impact the quality of life in a community. Different land uses have varying impacts on transportation and utility systems. The arrangement of land uses and their proximity also support or discourage different modes of travel, including bicycling, walking and transit use; this can directly impact the vehicular system by reducing or increasing traffic.

Towns and cities were traditionally built as mixed-use environments with housing, shops, offices, religious institutions, schools, parks, and factories all within a short walk of one another. As the benefits of mixed-use areas are rediscovered, it is increasingly important to understand the uses that can operate within an acceptable walking distance of five to ten minutes. Many uses are compatible, including retail, office, open space, civic, and residential uses. Others, such as industrial and transportation services, are more difficult to reconcile in a mixed-use setting.

Existing Conditions

The study area is marked by a variety of land uses as shown in Table 2.1: Existing Land Uses. Generally speaking, the two predominant uses, commercial and industrial, are clustered in large, single-use areas defined by access to road or freight rail facilities. As a result, commercial uses dominate both sides of Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard, while industrial uses are found between the two, where access to freight rail lines is greatest.

The third most prevalent land use, public/institutional, also tends to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: Existing Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1-4 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes auto salvage yards.
be clustered around the historic core of Doraville. Here governmental buildings and churches line the streets that once compromised the traditional downtown area.

Residential uses in the study area are limited to two apartment complexes (Shallowford Gardens and Wynchase Apartments) and a single-family area along Clyde and Terrell Drives. The latter is completely surrounded by industrial and warehouses uses, and its long-term viability for housing is unlikely.

Other than a few exceptions in Doraville’s historic core, the orientation and design of land uses in the study area focus completely on vehicular transportation. Uses are designed for access by car, and the distances between different uses (for example, offices and restaurants) are too great to walk, even if quality sidewalks were provided. The result is that the study area’s land uses fail to maximize the use of existing transit, or even provide residents with facilities that they can easily walk to, if so desired.

**Strengths**

- The area has excellent proximity to I-285, I-85, Perimeter Center, Buckhead, and the northeast Atlanta region.
- Nearby neighborhoods provide a good single-family base.
- Institutional uses, including schools, churches and public facilities, anchor the study area.

**Weaknesses**

- The lack of quality housing options in the study area could be a challenge as residents age and their housing needs change.
- There is a lack of mixed-use or pedestrian-friendly land uses.
- Although the study area houses some resident-serving commercial uses, it does not serve the full range of daily needs.
- Existing land uses fail to support walking or transit ridership.
- Many buildings are nearing structural obsolescence.

**Opportunities**

- The former GM site is one of the largest transit-served redevelopment sites in the nation and is an unprecedented opportunity.
- Creating a business center could capitalize on access and create jobs. For decades the emergence of an office center near I-285 and I-85 has been predicted, but has never materialized.
- New land use patterns could support walking and transit use.
- Additional housing options for all ages could be provided.

**Threats**

- Ill-planned development could preclude a new growth model.
- The costs of redevelopment and unproven market for mixed-use development could limit growth until the market matures.
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Figure 2.1: Existing Land Uses
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*Includes auto salvage yards.

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.

*Includes auto salvage yards.
Future Land Use Plan

Aside from existing land uses, land use considerations are also affected by the future land use designations of the local comprehensive plan. Such designations need not reflect on-the-ground uses today, but rather express the long-term land use vision for growth. They establish local policies that, under state law, must support proposed rezoning requests.

Existing Conditions

The future land use designations shown in Figure 2.2 are taken from the comprehensive plans of the City of Doraville and DeKalb County (which controlled the area west of Peachtree Road at the time of writing). Generally speaking, the land use classifications in the City of Doraville’s plan reflect a proactive vision for future growth, while DeKalb County’s reflect current on-the-ground uses.

In addition, the City of Doraville Comprehensive Plan 2006-2026 incorporates a variety of policies striving to support walkable, transit-supportive, and mixed-use development in much of the study area. Many of these emerged from the previous 2005 LCI effort and, therefore, are likely to support the vision that will emerge from this current effort.

Strengths

• Doraville’s Comprehensive Plan 2006-2026 contains many policies consistent with the principles of the LCI program, including concentrating mixed-use development near the MARTA station.
• Current land use policies allow the area to accommodate growth without commercial or multifamily encroachment into single-family areas.
• Current “Mixed Use Redevelopment Opportunity” classifications in much of the study area support a broad range of possibilities and allow the study area to respond to changing markets.

Opportunities

• A “Multimodal Transit Gateway” classification for the MARTA station could support transit-oriented development.

Threats

• Commercial classifications along all of Buford Highway and parts of Peachtree Boulevard could perpetuate their roles as barriers between the core of Doraville and nearby neighborhoods unless provisions are made for walkability in these areas.
• The “Industrial” classification just west of the former GM site may not be consistent with potential redevelopment next door.
Figure 2.2: Existing Future Land Use Plan
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This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.
Zoning

The third major land use consideration is zoning. Zoning is the legal framework that codifies the land use vision of a comprehensive plan to regulate development. It directly shapes the form, placement, and design of new projects, and therefore affects the future of how a community feels and functions more than any other single element.

Existing Conditions

The study area contains a variety of zoning districts that allow a mix of uses across it, but little mixture within individual developments. Although designated a “Mixed-Use Redevelopment Opportunity” in the City of Doraville's comprehensive plan, most of its zoning is conventional, single-use, and auto-oriented.

As shown in Figure 2.3: Existing Zoning shows, most of the study area within the City of Doraville is zoned C-1 Neighborhood Commercial or C-2 General Business. Both allow large exclusively commercial uses. Other districts found in the City of Doraville portion of the study area include R-3 Multiple-Family Residence District (Apartments), M-1 Light Industrial District, and OI Office/Institutional. The portion within Chamblee is zoned M Industrial from when it was in DeKalb County. Each of these allows the uses that their names suggest.

These entitlements amount to a great deal of by-right, unbuilt non-residential redevelopment potential in the study area, but very little residential. In fact, an estimated 75.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space would be allowed under current zoning, but only 222 housing units, as shown in Table 2.2. Most lies within the City of Doraville.

Table 2.2: Buildout Analysis Under Existing Zoning Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio</th>
<th>Dwelling Units/Acre</th>
<th>Total Zoned Commercial</th>
<th>Total Zoned Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,060,194 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1C</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,430,997 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,583,296 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>507,682 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 (formely DeKalb)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,648 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (formely DeKalb)</td>
<td>140.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,476,639 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1C</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>645,144 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>534,515 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,178,794 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>548.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>—</strong></td>
<td><strong>—</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,532,909 sf</strong></td>
<td><strong>222 units</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. An approximation of non-residential building density allowed by the code.
No design requirements exist in the current study area zoning within Doraville or Chamblee, although efforts are underway, to develop such requirements along Buford Highway within Doraville.

To mitigate the lack of mandated standards, the cities often approve rezoning requests on the condition of increased design standards. This has improved the design quality of some projects, but does not apply to those with by-right zoning.

As a future plan for the study area is developed, it may be necessary to revise zoning regulations to reflect the new community vision. This may include a new code or design standards.

**Strengths**
- Existing C-1 and C-2 districts have a maximum front setback, which supports walkability by bringing buildings to the street and encouraging side and rear parking.
- Industrial zoning in Chamblee is well-placed given noise from DeKalb Peachtree (PDK) Airport and freight rail access.

Please see Environmental Factors for details on airport noise.

**Weaknesses**
- The area is over-zoned for commercial, with 75.5 million square feet permitted, the equivalent of 42 Lenox Square Malls.
- Current zoning does not support quality residential uses within the study area or its potential redevelopment sites.
- Zoning does not support mixed-use development.
- No design standards exist today for new construction.
- The former GM site is zoned C-1C, which limits buildings to three floors and will have to change if the site is redeveloped.

**Opportunities**
- A new design-based overlay currently being prepared for Buford Highway could raise the bar for redevelopment in Doraville.
- Zoning changes could support the vision emerging from this plan.
- Easier permitting could encourage desired growth.
- Flexible, mixed-use zoning could allow projects to respond to changing market conditions and position the study area to capitalize on growth trends.

**Threats**
- Recent text amendments to prohibit wholesale and pawn businesses in C-1 and C-2 districts have created a distrust of zoning changes among some business owners.
- Opposition to zoning changes could hinder the ability to achieve the land use vision emerging from this plan.
- Zoning changes that do not match the City of Doraville’s ability to administer them could threaten their effectiveness.
Environmental Factors

The ways that communities are built are closely connected to the natural environment in which they are located. Development patterns affect and are affected by the natural environment in direct and indirect ways that must be considered in any planning process.

The direct environmental effects of development are those with a physical, on-site impact. These include things like topography, streams, forest lands, building performance, and noise. They must be considered during site design if negative environmental impacts are to be minimized.

Recent thinking has embraced a broader understanding of environmental impacts that also considers indirect factors. This perspective looks beyond the immediate impacts of activity on an individual site to also consider off-site impacts, especially energy consumed by transport. Given that in 2007 nearly 29 percent of the nation’s energy use was for transportation, and that in 2010 nearly 61 percent of transportation energy was used by cars, land use patterns that reduce the need to drive can have a significant and positive environmental impact. In some cases, their macro level environmental benefits can outweigh on-site disadvantages.

Existing Conditions

There are many direct environmental factors in the study area, both natural and man-made, that have a significant impact on its future.

The most notable natural feature is its hydrologic or water system. Because the area includes a ridge approximating New Peachtree Road, it occupies three watersheds. Water in the southeastern portion flows south to North Fork Peachtree Creek, water between Shallowford and New Peachtree Roads flows to Arrow Creek, and water north of New Peachtree Road flows to Nancy Creek. Additionally, the latter area includes the spring for Bubbling Creek, which emerges west of the former GM plant. As it flows west, its banks offer a strip of green


Figure 2.4: 2010 Transportation Energy Use (Source: US Department of Energy)

Figure 2.5: Aggregate energy consumption by housing type (Source: Jonathan Rose Companies)
passing through an otherwise developed area. The presence of the spring also suggests an aquifer below all or some of the area.

Man-made factors are also present, including noise and air pollution, and ground contaminants. Noise from PDK Airport is high in the southwest part of the study area, making it challenging for residential. Noise levels from I-285 are also high, as is localized air pollution around it (research shows that airborne particulate matter is greatest within 300 meters downwind of highways\(^3\)). Finally, the presence of industrial and commercial uses suggests that ground contaminants may exist on some sites, although such can only be determined through an Environmental Site Assessment.

Indirect environmental factors in the study area are more difficult to quantify, but still significant. Most notable of these are the driving patterns of area residents that result from the community’s built form, the lack of employment, and the lack of commercial amenities in the area. If jobs, services, housing, and other amenities were provided in a walkable setting, it is certain that many more people would walk and take transit than currently do, benefiting public health, the environment, and their wallets in the process.

**Strengths**
- Streams, including Bubbling Creek, exist in the study area.
- Flood zones ensure that many areas will remain open space.

**Weaknesses**
- Noise from PDK Airport limits future housing in places.
- Noise and pollution from I-285 is a challenge.
- Parking lots contribute to radiant heating and water runoff.
- There is a lack of landscaping on streets or in parking lots.
- The area’s built form encourages driving.

**Opportunities**
- “Green” building and planning techniques could allow growth with a lesser impact on the local environment.
- Creek corridors and flood zones could be future greenways.
- Compact, mixed-use development could reduce driving.
- Certain housing options could reduce energy consumption.
- Water retention ponds could be environmental amenities.
- Innovative stormwater management techniques, such as bio-swales or pervious paving, could reduce runoff.

**Threats**
- Historic industrial or commercial uses could be contaminated.
- Ill-placed housing, schools, etc. could harm public health.
- Expansion of the PDK Airport could increase noise pollution.

---

Figure 2.6: Existing Environmental Conditions
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About This Map
This map shows environmental factors identified in public data from State and Federal Sources. It also identifies uses often associated with soil contamination, especially those involving vehicle repair and storage. The map does not suggest that there is actually contamination present on these sites in Doraville. Such can only be determined through detailed study beyond this scope of this project.

About Airport Noise
The 65 Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) contour, as defined by the FAA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, is the benchmark contour which is normally compatible with residential uses. Less sensitive uses, such as commercial and industrial, are normally compatible with higher DNL levels of 70 or 75 dB.
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Addison Dr
Wilton Ave
Chestnut Dr
Allen Dr
Eula Cir
Chamblee Dunwoody Rd
Carver Dr
Mill Ct
Parsons Dr
Clyde Dr
Longmire Way
N Shallowford Rd
Alison Dr
Autumn Dr
Gentilly Pl
N Dekalb Dr
Terrell Dr
Park Ave
Deacon Ln
Havalyn Ln
Winters Chapel Rd
Oakmont Ave
Wheeler Dr
Colquitt Dr
Central Ave
Clemson Dr
Wallace Dr
Brook Park Way
John Glenn Dr
Church Dr
Clearview Pkwy
Lambeth Cir
Forrest Ct
Bonnie Ave
Clearview Ave
E Johnson Cir
Garrett Cir
Lambeth Ln
Jess Norman Way
Placid Rd
Beechwood Ave
Buena Vista Ave
W Johnson Cir
Stafford Pl
Ingersoll Rand Dr
Lambeth Ln
Jess Norman Way
Peachtree Industrial Blvd
New Peachtree Rd
Doraville Transit Station
City of Doraville
Prosperity Cemetery
2.3 Transportation

A community’s transportation system is comprised of several interconnected components that work together to move people and goods within a given area. These include vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities. Together, these different components interact with one another to affect travel mode, land use and system flexibility.

More than anything else, traffic is affected by the organization of the streets and blocks within which they occur. In fact, these are the most defining characteristics of a community and its transportation system. While buildings and land uses change, the street pattern of a community often remains unchanged over centuries.

Blocks and streets can be thought of as the bones of a community. Just as bones determine a person’s height, stature, and looks, block and street patterns directly affect a community’s form and the importance of key sites within it. There are two major types of street patterns:

**Dendritic** or branch-like street systems are made up of many small and disconnected local streets that feed into fewer collector streets that, in turn, feed into even fewer arterials. Because this pattern contains many dead-end local streets, it forces all traffic onto collectors and arterials, resulting in large block sizes and increased trip distances.

Dendritic street patterns tend to discourage walking, encourage traffic congestion on collectors and arterials, and create a transportation system that is prone to shutdown when accidents or other incidents disrupt traffic on collectors or arterials. Its creation of longer trips also supports conventional suburban-style land uses marked by automobile orientation, separation of use, and disregard for the quality of the streetscape. These great distances also have a direct impact on the ability of emergency vehicles to respond to situations in an efficient manner.

**Interconnected** street systems are made up of a series of small and medium sized streets arranged in a grid or modified grid pattern. In this pattern, virtually all streets connect to other streets. This provides small blocks, ensuring many possible routes and eliminating the need for wide, high-traffic arterials and collectors.

An interconnected street pattern encourages walking, bicycling, and other forms of non-motorized transportation because it increases the likelihood of being able to make a trip without being forced onto a high-speed, high-volume road. It also tends to support pedestrian-oriented land uses by allowing land uses to be closer together, thus increasing the opportunities for shared parking and pedestrian-oriented streetscapes.
“Smart growth” principles generally support an interconnected system over a dendritic system, because it better balances pedestrian and vehicular needs. Both cars and pedestrians operate more efficiently when many routes of travel, shorter distances, and more direct trips are available.

Generally, the largest a block should be is 800 feet in length or 3,200 feet in perimeter, although between 200 and 600 feet in length or 800 to 2,400 feet in perimeter is more desirable. In developed areas with an existing dendritic system, achieving this can be a challenge because interconnected systems work best over a large area. In most places, the reality is that arterials and collectors serve transportation needs that extend beyond the immediate area. Even so, a localized interconnected system can reduce congestion on these streets by dispersing local trips.

**Traffic Systems**

Traffic system operations are affected by a variety of factors, including intersection operations, signal timings, turning movements, volume, capacity, and speeds. The interface of these different components affects each other and defines the ability of the whole system to operate efficiently and as part of a well-balanced system.

**Existing Street Network**

The existing street network in the study area includes an urban interstate principal arterial, urban principal arterials, urban minor arterials, urban collector streets and urban local streets serving regional and local needs. The roadways in the study area are primarily four-lane and two-lane roadways with curbs. Four State Routes (SR) pass through the study area:

- **SR 13 (Buford Highway)** provides northeast/southwest regional access through the southern part of the study area.
- **SR 13CO (Motor Industrial Way)** provides east/west regional access between SR 13 and SR 141 in the study area.
- **SR 141 (Peachtree Boulevard)** provides northeast/southwest regional access through the north part of the study area.
- **SR 407 (I-285)** provides east/west regional access through the northern portion of the study area.

As expected, SR 407 (I-285) is classified as an urban interstate principal arterial throughout the study area, and both SR 13 and SR 141 are classified as urban principal arterials for their entirety. New Peachtree Road, Shallowford Road, and Motors Industrial Way are urban minor arterial streets within the study area. A portion of Peachtree Road and all of North Peachtree Road are urban collector streets within the study area. Remaining streets are local streets.
Existing Freight Rail

A Norfolk Southern rail line is located in the study area. The line is parallel to and between Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard, and runs in an northeast to southwest direction. It has been observed that approximately eight freight trains pass through the area each weekday, at an average speed of 15 miles per hour (mph). In addition, rail yards often provide staging areas for additional trains.

Existing Traffic Signals

There are 17 total traffic signals in the study area, including:

- Eight along Buford Highway that include pedestrian signals and crosswalks,
- Four along Peachtree Boulevard that include pedestrian signals and crosswalks, and
- Five along New Peachtree Road that include pedestrian signals and crosswalks.

Existing Traffic Calming Devices

No traffic calming devices exist within the limits of the study area.

Existing Parking

No on street parking exists along any of the urban arterial or collector streets. On street parking is un-striped on three local streets: Clyde Drive, Terrell Drive, and Church Street.

Existing Truck Routes

The current truck routes through Doraville are the four state routes, SR 407, SR 13, SR 13CO, SR 141, urban minor arterial streets New Peachtree Road and Shallowford Road, urban collector streets Peachtree Road and North Peachtree Road, and local streets Peachtree Road and Clearview Avenue.

Existing Speed Limits

Speed limits within the study area vary vastly depending upon the functional class of the roadway. The speed limit on the urban interstate principal arterial is 55 mph. The speed limit on the urban principal arterial, urban minor arterial and urban collector streets generally varies between 45 and 35 mph. The majority of the local streets are 35 mph, and 25 mph in some areas.

Existing Travel Patterns

Two urban principal arterials run through the study area that link the surrounding suburbs to downtown Atlanta. Therefore on a typical business day these roads, Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard, experience congestion during “rush hours.” Rush hour can be defined as the time between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. when motorists are travelling to work or school, and 4:00 and 7 p.m. when motorists are returning to their homes. Significant points of congestion on these roads are their intersections with the urban interstate principal arterial, I-285. Traffic congests at the traffic signals where the two urban principal arterials intersect with I-285. Due to the high volume of motorist passing through this area, a certain level of congestion is to be expected.
Figure 2.7: Existing Roadway Classification
### Existing Traffic Volume

The following volumes are consistent with the functional roadway classifications for each street. State Routes having the higher volumes are principal arterials, the minor arterials have the 2,000 and 5,000 AADT volumes and the collector roadways are less, coming in at 2,000 AADT and lower.

### Planned Future Projects

Several planned projects and proposed plans have been developed for the study area due to its proximity to I-85 and I-285. Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) and the Transit Planning Board (TPB) both have regional concept plans for multi-transit improvements in or adjacent to the study area.

#### Table 2.3: Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>2009 TRAFFIC VOLUMES (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buford Highway (SR 13), between Motor Industrial Way (SR 13CO) and Central Avenue</td>
<td>24,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buford Highway (SR 13), between Park Avenue and Shallowford Road</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141), between Peachtree Road and Interstate 285 (SR 407)</td>
<td>28,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue, south of Church Street</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallowford Road, at Chamblee-Dunwoody Road</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallowford Road, between New Peachtree Road and Buford Highway (SR13)</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachtree Road, between North Peachtree Road and Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141)</td>
<td>3,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Peachtree Road, between Central Avenue and Stewart Road</td>
<td>12,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Peachtree Road, between Shallowford Road and West Hospital Avenue</td>
<td>7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Industrial Way, between Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141) and Buford Highway (SR 13)</td>
<td>11,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 285 (SR 407), between Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141) and Buford Highway (SR 13)</td>
<td>249,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp onto I-285 (SR 407) from Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141) North and South, and Motor Industrial Way</td>
<td>28,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On ramp to Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141) North from I-285 (SR 407) West</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On ramp to Buford Highway (SR 13) from I-285 (SR 407) West</td>
<td>7,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revive 285 top end is an innovative approach by GDOT in conjunction with the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) to develop a comprehensive solution for the northern part of I-285 that started in 2006 to explore traffic management options.

- Originally eight build alternates were created in 2008. The list was then trimmed to three build alternatives and one no-build alternative:
  - Alternative 1: No Build, which is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA);
  - Alternative 4: Express bus and operational Improvements;
  - Alternative 6A: Express bus, managed lanes, operational Improvements, and future transit right-of-way; and
  - Alternative 6B: Express bus, managed lanes, operational improvements, future transit right-of-way, and general purpose lane re-designation.

- Environmental impacts are being studied for each alternative.
- GDOT anticipates holding a public hearing towards the end of 2011 to present the alternatives.
- GDOT anticipates a final recommendation by the end of 2012.

Concept 3 is a regional planning document produced by the TPB for the metro-Atlanta area. This concept plan evaluates the conditions of the existing road, rail, and bus infrastructures and proposes future improvements and additions to these systems.

Proposed improvements impacting the Doraville Area include:
- Express Regional Rail service on the existing railroad to Gainesville.
- Express buses running in managed lanes on I-285.

Two of the alternatives being explored as part of Revive 285 top end include transit that would significantly impact the study area and may include utilizing a portion of the former GM Assembly as a yard for light rail vehicles, subject to right-of-way acquisition. (Courtesy www.revive285.com)
GDOT planned projects include:
- A Sidewalk Enhancement Project on Peachtree Boulevard ends at Peachtree Road. This project is just outside of the study area. The GDOT PI # is 0002410.
- A Sidewalk Enhancement Project on Buford Highway ends at Shallowford Terrace. This project is just outside of the study area. The GDOT PI # is 731770.

Project Development Process

There are a number of steps to be taken in the project development process. Some of these include:
- Developing consensus among stakeholders and community leaders on issues that need to be addressed, so that there is motivation to proceed with project implementation steps;
- Identifying a small number of projects or alternate solutions that appear to cost effectively solve the problem;
- Perform preliminary design, environmental, project cost and right-of-way analyses;
- Begin considering sources of funding from traditional and, if possible, non-traditional sources;
- Conduct public hearings to share findings and solicit comments;
- Reflect comments;
- Build consensus on action plan among elected officials;
- Identify projects, finalize designs, and finalize right-of-way needs;
- Secure funding agreements and get projects programmed into the ARC’s and GDOT’s formal programming documents: Regional Transportation Plan (ARC); Transportation Improvement Program (ARC); and, Statewide Improvement Program (GDOT).

If the City develops a set of projects that has community support and addresses mobility, access and safety concerns, then the projects will have a very good chance to receive funding from traditional sources even though the implementation timeline may not be clear. This also means the City will need to supply local matching funds toward the total project cost. Local matching funds often take the form of preliminary engineering studies, site preparation work such as utility relocation and right-of-way acquisition.

Strengths
- There is easy access to several State Routes including SR 407, SR 13, SR 13CO and SR 141.
- There is easy access to I-85 and I-285.
- There is adequate off-street commercial parking.
- Traffic signals seem to be synchronized to adequately move traffic on major streets.
- These presence of turn lanes and flush medians on major roads reduces traffic congestion.

Weaknesses
- There is congestion during peak hours.
- The existing traffic system is not interconnected to provide multiple route options.
- There are poor connections to the GM site across both the rail line and I-285.
- There is only one grade-separated railroad crossing at Motor Industrial Way.
- The intersection configuration at New Peachtree Road and Shallowford Road is not ideal.
- There is a large amount of traffic “passing thru” on Central Avenue and Park Avenue.
• The five-legged intersection of Peachtree Boulevard, Peachtree Road, North Shallowford Road, and Parson Drive creates delay along Peachtree Boulevard.
• High concentrations of curb-cuts along Buford Highway create negative traffic flow and pose pedestrian hazards.
• Block sizes are extremely large, which forces traffic onto a few major corridors.

Opportunities
• The Shallowford Road and New Peachtree Road intersection could be redesigned to improve flow.
• A flush median may be possible on New Peachtree Road.
• Installation of solar power signs alerting drivers of current status and drive times of I-285 could reduce congestion on urban principal arterials.
• A new street crossing the MARTA and Norfolk Southern rail lines could improve accessibility.
• Connecting said new street to Peachtree Boulevard and Buford Highway/Shallowford Road could make it regionally significant and expand potential funding options.
• New development could expand the street network.

Threats
• Additional traffic signals could further congest State Routes and increase travel time.
• Connectivity of street system could increase traffic volume on local streets.
• The high cost of crossing the railroad with a road could prohibit its implementation.
• A potential bridge rail crossing could decrease development opportunities for adjacent properties.
Pedestrian Facilities

Because every trip begins on foot, the walking experience is critical to understanding the current transportation system. Pedestrian trips are also important because they can take the stress off of vehicular systems and create a safer study area.

Existing Conditions

Existing pedestrian circulation south of the MARTA rail line is predominantly focused toward the MARTA station and New Peachtree Road. North of the line, pedestrian activity is focused around businesses along Peachtree Boulevard. Due to its location and proximity to major travel corridors, the study area sees a high volume of traffic “passing thru” during peak hours. This means that many pedestrians in the area are traveling through it on their way to or from somewhere else, especially MARTA.

The sidewalks within the study area can be quantified as primary and secondary in terms of their average daily foot traffic. The greatest number of pedestrians can be found on Buford Highway, Peachtree Boulevard, and New Peachtree Road. These main pedestrian corridors serve as a passage to commercial areas and gateways to other forms of public transit. Secondary sidewalks can be classified as the routes that connect between the three primary sidewalks. These serve as a means of access from the residential sectors to the main pedestrian corridors.

Most existing sidewalks are in good structural condition. However there are several instances of gaps, which discourage continuous safe pedestrian passage. Future improvements are planned along New Peachtree Road between Stewart Road and Shallowford Road and Park Avenue in its entirety. These future streetscape projects will provide improved sidewalks and crosswalks, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, and improved lighting; thus improving flow and accessibility to the MARTA station.

Strengths

- Recent improvements create a starting point for raising the quality of walking in the study area.
- Sidewalks exist on most streets in the study area, including several with sidewalks on both sides.
- Many recent immigrants come from cultures where walking was a part of everyday life, and still do so in the study area.

Weaknesses

- The combination of development patterns, existing facilities, and distances create a study area that is not truly walkable.
- There is poor pedestrian access across the rail tracks.
- Most buildings have frontal parking and sit back from the street.
Figure 2.8: Existing Sidewalk Conditions
• Missing or poorly-marked crosswalks makes walking unsafe.
• There are few walkways from buildings to the sidewalk in existing auto-oriented sites.
• The parking configuration along North Peachtree Road at Peachtree Boulevard, in front of auto body shop, allows vehicles to park on the sidewalk and in the road shoulder, reducing pedestrian accessibility.
• There is little sidewalk connectivity on key streets.
• ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities are lacking at many intersections.
• A collapsed catch basin and sidewalk settling on New Peachtree Road prevent wheelchairs from safely crossing I-285.
• High concentrations of curb-cuts on some major corridors create many potential vehicle-pedestrian conflict points.
• Widely-spaced and sometimes unmarked crossings along Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard encourage pedestrians to cross at unmarked locations.
• There are few street trees to provide shade in summer months.
• Large blocks make walking distances very great.

Opportunities
• Planned sidewalks upgrades on New Peachtree Road, Central Avenue, and Park Avenue will make walking safer.
• The proximity of shops and transit makes walking a viable form of transportation if improved, continuous facilities are provided.
• Crosswalks could be re-striped or better marked on many streets.
• Potential pedestrian improvements on major streets could improve safety.
• New sidewalk could provide connectivity on major streets
• Street furnishings could establish and maintain a community image.
• Additional sidewalks constructed on new proposed streets to provide supplementary travel routes for pedestrians.
• New signalized intersections along major corridors, if warranted, could also provide improved pedestrian crossings.
• A western entrance and pedestrian bridge at the MARTA station could improve access to potential redevelopment.
• Mid-block paths could improve access on large blocks.

Threats
• Continued development of commercial buildings set back from pedestrian facilities could decrease pedestrian activity.
• Redevelopment could increase pedestrian crossings on State Routes and create conflicts if facilities are not improved.
Bicycle Facilities

Bicycles are an increasingly important means of transportation in today's society. A balanced transportation system including a mix of transit and bicycle facilities can help diversify the how people travel. Bicycle facilities can take four major forms.

**Off-street bicycle facilities** are generally ten to twelve feet wide off-road paved areas that permit travel in two directions; lanes may or may not be striped. Usually, these facilities are built in conjunction with greenways, and their off-road nature makes them ideal for inexperienced bicyclists.

**Bicycle lanes** are striped one-way on-street facilities. They are usually located next to the curb so bicyclists move in the same direction as traffic, and are sometimes found next to parking spaces. In Georgia, designated bicycle lanes are required to have a minimum width of five feet. However, undesignated bike lanes can be striped narrower widths. Lanes are strongly suggested on streets with vehicular speeds greater than 25 miles per hour.

**Cycle tracks** combine the experience of an off-street bicycle facility with the on-street infrastructure of a bicycle lane. They provide a protected, dedicated bicycling area physically separated from motor traffic and distinct from the sidewalk.

**Sharrow markings** are installed in a street’s travel lane to alert drivers that bicyclists also use the roadway. They also assist bicyclists with lateral positioning, encourage safe passing of bicyclists by motorists, and reduce the incidence of wrong-way bicycling. Sharrows are often used where streets are too narrow for dedicated bicycle lanes.

**Existing Conditions**

Currently there are moderate levels of bicycling in the study area, but no bicycle facilities, although existing plans do recommend them. For example, in the DeKalb County Comprehensive Transportation Plan bicycle lanes are recommended along Shallowford Road/New Peachtree Road, North Peachtree Road, and portions of Peachtree Road. Along Central Avenue, the North Fork Peachtree Trail facility is also recommended to connect the MARTA station to a planned greenway along North Fork Peachtree Creek to the south. Whether said facility is an off-street path, bicycle lanes, or just a shared roadway is not identified in the plan.

**Strengths**

- Many people do bicycle in the study area, in spite of poor bicycling conditions.
- Relatively low vehicular volumes and speeds make on-street bicycling feasible along secondary streets in the study area.
Weaknesses

- The State Routes in the study area are automobile-oriented, creating a hostile environment for bicyclists, even to cross them.
- High truck traffic creates a hostile environment for bicyclists.
- Narrow streets create safety concerns for bicyclists where vehicular speeds are high.
- The lack of bicycle racks forces bicyclists to park their bikes against utility poles, signs, and on other elements.
- Extreme north-south topography in the study area is a challenging for bicyclists.

Opportunities

- Due to the high demand of public transit and large number of pedestrians in the area there is the potential to significantly increase bicycle use.
- Existing plans identify potential bicycle links between the study area and nearby communities.
- Creation of off-street paths could tie residential areas to parks and open space, downtown, and surrounding communities.
- Bike routes or sharrow markings could be established on streets that are too narrow for bike lanes, cycle tracks, or paths.
- The installation of bicycle racks at existing businesses or within new developments could promote bicycle use.

Threats

- Development of bicycle facilities at the expense of existing vehicular lanes could negatively impact vehicular flow on urban principal arterials.
- Implementing bicycle lanes or other facilities along existing State Routes could create a false sense of security and actually expose more bicyclists to unsafe conditions.
Public Transportation

While public transit accounts for only 2.5 percent of trips made in the Atlanta metropolitan region, interest in transit is growing as traffic congestion increases and demographics change, especially the aging population, create demand for alternatives to driving.

Existing Conditions

One of the greatest resources of the study area is the abundance of public transportation it can offer residents and visitors. Multiple bus carriers, MARTA rail, and the nearby PDK Airport all offer advanced methods of travel.

Three public bus services currently service the study area. The largest is MARTA, which currently has 40 bus stops and operates five routes within it. These routes carry passengers down every major road and some local streets, with multiple stops along both sides of Buford Highway, Peachtree Boulevard, New Peachtree Road, and North Peachtree Road. Some bus stops are shared with other bus providers such as GRTA and other private providers. As a whole the bus system operates efficiently and productively within the study area. In addition to MARTA, GRTA Xpress bus service connects the Doraville transit station to the City of Johns Creek, while one Gwinnett Community Transit (GCT) route provides a link to nearby Gwinnett County.

The study area also contains a MARTA Rail Station which is the end station for the Northeast MARTA “Gold” line. The station is located at 6000 New Peachtree Road, and is only accessible from New Peachtree Road. The station has free daily parking, long term parking for $8/day, bike racks, and is a stop point for five out of the seven bus routes that travel through the study area. Many passengers travel from the Northeast suburbs of Atlanta to the Doraville station for free parking and inexpensive travel downtown. It has been observed that between 4:45 a.m. and 1:45 a.m., approximately 170 passenger trains pass through the study area each weekday.

Located just south of the study area is DeKalb Peachtree Airport, which is Georgia’s second busiest airport with over 220,000 flights per year. It is a 700+ acre facility that 500+ aircraft are based. The annual air shows can attract large amounts visitors.

Strengths

• The existing MARTA station is a significant transit investment that is unlikely to be replicated in the region anytime soon.
• MARTA rail and bus systems operate sufficiently well.
• There are multiple options for transit, including public bus and rail service, along with several private services

Table 2.4: Daily Bus Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA #25</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA #39</td>
<td>6,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA #104</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA #124</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT #10</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpress #408</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Atlanta Regional Commission, Household Travel Survey, (2002)
Figure 2.9: Existing Transit Map

Legend
- MARTA Station
- MARTA Buses:
  - Green: Bus #25
  - Blue: Bus #39
  - Red: Bus #47
  - Orange: Bus #104
  - Brown: Bus #124
  - Blue: Bus #132

*After September 2010 service cuts

Other Buses Serving the Rail Station:
- GRTA Xpress #408 Johns Creek
- Gwinnett County Transit #10
- Private bus service

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.
• The current intermodal facility at the Doraville MARTA station provides an efficient transition between modes.
• Being the northeastern-most MARTA station attracts commuters from the suburbs.

Weaknesses
• The MARTA station (and the system, in general) is currently under-utilized.
• The Doraville MARTA station is only accessible from one side.
• No dedicated bus lanes for faster service exist, especially along Buford Highway.
• The lack of transit-supportive uses around the transit station limits its ability to attract riders.
• Many bus stops lack benches, shelter, or posted schedules.
• The lack of quality pedestrian facilities also negatively impacts transit ridership, as every transit strip starts on-foot.
• Closely spaced bus stops on Buford Highway contribute to frequent stopping, and thereby reduce bus reliability and speed.
• There is limited transit service between Doraville’s neighborhoods and the city’s center.

Opportunities
• Covered bus stops and seating could enhance rider comfort.
• Incorporating signal preemption, or dedicated bus lanes could streamline bus service.
• Transit-supportive land uses could make using transit a desirable option for a larger population.
• Making the area more transit-friendly could reduce the expense of car ownership and allow people to spend more on housing.

Threats
• A northeastern expansion of the existing MARTA “Gold” line could decrease ridership at the Doraville Station, but could also free up parking for redevelopment.
• Redevelopment adjacent to the MARTA transit station could fail to foster ridership if safe, convenient connections are not provided between it and the station.
2.4 Markets & Economics

With an understanding of Doraville’s current market geography, its demographic makeup, as well as the retail and housing demand within the region, sound recommendations for the development of Doraville and its LCI study area can be made.

This market research addresses not only the demand within the LCI study area, but also that within the larger region as identified as the relevant market for Doraville. The study looks at demographic, retail, residential, and employment trends. The data outlines opportunities that can be supported within the Doraville LCI study area. Ultimately, it will be important to develop economic development strategies and incentives to direct these market opportunities to the study area and realize the community’s vision as expressed in this master plan.

Market Areas

Unlike most LCI studies, which focus on relatively small geographic areas, the redevelopment of the Doraville study area, particularly the former GM Assembly, represent a significant opportunity that extends well beyond the local area. Given its size and location it is likely that the development of the plant will affect the entire Atlanta region with the potential to bring in jobs, residents, and new investment. While much of this will depend on the type and scale of the specific development occurring some time in the future, current opportunity for retail, residential, and job growth will come from the immediate region.

For the purposes of this market study, the study area was compared to additional geographies including the corporate limits of Doraville, 10-minute drive time, 20-minute drive time, and the Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The 10 and 20-minute drive times reflect the primary and secondary trade areas for Doraville, those regions where most customers may come from. These trade areas are consistent with those identified in the 2005 LCI study for Doraville. The data provided in this study should provide a good comparison with the previous analysis, given the changes in the market as the result of the current economic downturn. For the residential and employment market, Doraville and the current study area were compared to the Atlanta MSA as well as the counties of DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett.
Demographics

Lying in the northern part of DeKalb County, Doraville is in a region that experienced a high level of population and household growth from 1990 to 2010. While the area has seen fast growth, the trend has lessened over the past decade. For example, while DeKalb County grew by 22 percent between 1990 and 2000, the growth lessened to 12.9 percent to the current level.

Table 2.5: Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent Growth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCI Study Area</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>9,862</td>
<td>9,741</td>
<td>9,669</td>
<td>-1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minute</td>
<td>247,311</td>
<td>265,706</td>
<td>277,194</td>
<td>7.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute</td>
<td>1,276,713</td>
<td>1,464,493</td>
<td>1,567,034</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>4,247,981</td>
<td>5,569,195</td>
<td>6,182,135</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>665,865</td>
<td>751,419</td>
<td>788,726</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>816,006</td>
<td>1,051,207</td>
<td>1,162,204</td>
<td>28.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td>588,448</td>
<td>822,061</td>
<td>929,341</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: Household Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Percent Growth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCI Study Area</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minute</td>
<td>97,862</td>
<td>103,985</td>
<td>108,116</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute</td>
<td>513,794</td>
<td>581,388</td>
<td>618,769</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>1,554,154</td>
<td>2,005,649</td>
<td>2,215,420</td>
<td>29.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>249,339</td>
<td>277,474</td>
<td>289,900</td>
<td>11.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>321,242</td>
<td>402,805</td>
<td>440,974</td>
<td>25.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td>202,317</td>
<td>274,691</td>
<td>307,754</td>
<td>35.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source for chart and both tables: Arnett Muldrow & Associates. Claritas, Inc.
year. This trend is consistent with that of the trade areas, which saw the 10-minute area grow in population by 7.4 percent since 2000 and the 20-minute trade area growing 14.7 percent in the same time frame.

On the other hand, Doraville and the study area showed significantly less growth since 2000, with the Doraville actually losing population by current year estimates. With the 10-minute and 20-minute trade areas showing similar population increases to that of DeKalb County, it is likely that this population slowdown in Doraville is due in part to the decrease in jobs resulting from the GM plant closing. In the next five years, the 10-minute trade area is projected to grow by 4.3 percent, the 20-minute by 7 percent, and the study area by just 2.7 percent. Doraville is expected to lose nearly 1 percent of its population over the next five years.

A comparison of regional median household income figures shows that the City of Doraville, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or Area</th>
<th>2010 Median Household Income</th>
<th>2010 Per Cap Income</th>
<th>2010 Median Age</th>
<th>2010 HH Size</th>
<th>2010 Travel Time</th>
<th>2010 Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCI Study Area</td>
<td>$46,908</td>
<td>$22,714</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>$45,221</td>
<td>$19,544</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minute</td>
<td>$56,456</td>
<td>$30,320</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute</td>
<td>$59,908</td>
<td>$34,487</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>$60,647</td>
<td>$28,777</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>$55,462</td>
<td>$27,097</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>$61,746</td>
<td>$36,625</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td>$66,542</td>
<td>$27,065</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source for all data shown on this page: Claritas, Inc.
Doraville zip code 30340, and the study area are all at the lower end of the scale. The 10-minute and 20-minute trade areas are in the mid-range, similar to that of the Atlanta MSA. The Dunwoody zip code (30338) has the highest regional income, which is nearly twice that of the City of Doraville. Per Capita income figures show a similar trend with Doraville and the LCI study area ranking at the lower end.

Other demographic indicators show:

- In terms of income distribution, Doraville tends to shift towards the lower end as compared to the region. Fifty seven percent of households in Doraville have incomes less than $50,000, and there are fewer households in the upper ranges above $125,000.
- Doraville shows a higher poverty rate with 13.8 percent of families below poverty level. For families with children, the rate is 25.1 percent.
- Doraville is an ethnically diverse community. Approximately 14.2 percent of the population is of Asian ancestry with 22 percent being some other race. This is compared to the Atlanta MSA which sees 89 percent of its population as either white or black alone. Nearly 50 percent of Doraville’s population is of Hispanic origin.
- Doraville is also multilingual with just 46 percent of its population speaking English alone at home, 38 percent speaking Spanish, 3 percent speaking an Indo-European language, 10 percent speaking an Asian language, and 3 speaking an other language.
- According to ARC, the year over year population increase in the 10-county Atlanta region (just 24,700 people) is the slowest year of growth since 1950.

As a comparison, the ARC’s recently published 2040 Forecast which showed:

- Population in the Atlanta region is projected to grow another 3 million people by 2040 to 8.3 million
- The population is aging, particularly with whites and blacks, while the Latino population is getting younger. This aging population will ultimately shrink the labor force participation rate. The largest percent increase by 2040 will be ages 65 & older (318 percent).
- Like Doraville, the region will continue to become more ethnically diverse. By 2015, the white population will no longer be a true majority as black and ethnic populations grow. By 2040, the Atlanta metro is projected to be 35 percent white, 35 percent black, 20 percent Latino, with other ethnicities rounding out the mix.
Retail Market

Doraville’s existing retail market is located primarily along Buford Highway, Peachtree Boulevard, and New Peachtree Road. The LCI study area covers portions of each of these areas.

- **Buford Highway** – This corridor is the primary commercial artery in Doraville leading from Chamblee, through Doraville, to Norcross. In Doraville, Buford Highway has a mixture of uses that are predominantly retail. Strip shopping centers such as Northwoods Plaza, Pinetree Shopping Center, and Asian Square are located along this road, along with standalone convenience, restaurant, and office uses. Outside the study area to the north centers include the Buford Highway Farmer’s Market shopping center, Doraville Plaza, Big K plaza, and others.

- **New Peachtree Road** – New Peachtree parallels Buford Highway through Doraville, extending from its intersection with Buford Highway north of I-285, down to Chamblee-Dunwoody Road in Chamblee to the south. Through Doraville and the study area, it includes a mixture of office and service uses with limited retail. It is also the location of the Doraville MARTA station, as well as the entrance to Doraville’s government and civic uses along Park and Central Avenues.

- **Peachtree Boulevard** – Through the LCI study area, Peachtree Boulevard is the location of a cluster of regional auto dealerships serving the northern Atlanta metro. It is also the location of the Peachtree Pavilion Center including BrandsMart, H-mart, and various office and commercial uses.

Doraville exists in an urban retail market with a significant amount of competition. Chamblee, Dunwoody, Tucker, Sandy Springs, and Norcross surround Doraville, and all are retail centers that draw from the Doraville market. Doraville’s retail is primarily in older shopping centers including a fair amount of vacant or under-utilized space.

In major shopping centers alone, there is nearly 13 million square feet of existing or planned retail space within a 15-minute drive of the study area. These centers are various ages and sizes, ranging from Perimeter Mall (1971, 1.5 million sf) to The Prado in Sandy Springs (2009, 345,000 sf). All have Class-A retail space and tenants, and many have space available to absorb regional demand. Also, three of the major centers above are under development with planned mixed-uses and high-end retail. Each of these (Town Brookhaven, Streets of Buckhead, and Town Briarcliff) has seen their development timetable extended due to the current economic climate.

There is an additional 7 million square feet of retail space in neighborhood and community shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.8: Regional Shopping Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Claritas, Inc.*

Buford Highway is a regional center for Asian and Hispanic retailers

Peachtree Boulevard houses many automobile dealerships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Center</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Anchors</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Year Open</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>GLA (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Plaza</td>
<td>Briarcliff</td>
<td>Mercado Del Pueblo, Goodwill, Atlanta Ballroom</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>441,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Briarcliff</td>
<td>Briarcliff</td>
<td>None (in development)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Brookhaven</td>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>None (in development - Costco, Publix)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox Marketplace</td>
<td>Buckhead</td>
<td>Target, Dick's, Filene's Basement</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>429,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox Square</td>
<td>Buckhead</td>
<td>Macy's, Bloomingdale's, Neiman Marcus</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,545,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phipps Plaza</td>
<td>Buckhead</td>
<td>Belk, Nordstrom, Saks Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>826,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Streets of Buckhead</td>
<td>Buckhead</td>
<td>Equinox Fitness Club&amp;Spa</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embry Village</td>
<td>Chamblee</td>
<td>Kroger, Goodyear</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>354,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Fiesta</td>
<td>Chamblee</td>
<td>Burlington Coat, Marshalls</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North DeKalb Mall</td>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>Macy's, Burlington Coat Factory, AMC 16</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>635,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetree Plaza</td>
<td>Doraville</td>
<td>None (Independent ethnic shopping, dining)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>206,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Expo</td>
<td>Dunwoody</td>
<td>Marshalls, Best Buy, Vacant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>175,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Mall</td>
<td>Dunwoody</td>
<td>Macy's, Dillard's, Nordstrom, Bloomingdale's</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Place</td>
<td>Dunwoody</td>
<td>SuperTarget, Drexel Heritage, Ross, Loehmann's</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>452,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Pointe</td>
<td>Dunwoody</td>
<td>Sports Authority, Babies R Us, Regal Theatres</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>353,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckhead Crossing</td>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>Ross Dress For Less, Marshalls, HomeGoods</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>221,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh City Center</td>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>None (mixed-use, Marta HQ, AT&amp;T)</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh Plaza</td>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>Target, Home Depot, Best Buy, Vacant</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Forum</td>
<td>Norcross</td>
<td>Belk, Barnes &amp; Noble</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prado</td>
<td>Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Target, Home Depot, Publix, Staples</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood Marketplace</td>
<td>Suwanee</td>
<td>SuperTarget, Home Depot, Bed Bath &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>409,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofer Crossing</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Wal-Mart, Kroger, Vacant</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>272,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northlake Mall</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Sears, Macy's, JCPenney, Kohl's</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>969,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northlake Tower Festival</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Toys 'R' Us, AMC Theatres, Haverty's</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>304,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directory of Major Malls, ESRI
centers within a 10-minute drive of the study area. This includes products such as Pinetree Plaza and Doraville Plaza. Like the major centers, there is a certain amount of vacant and under-utilized space in these centers. All told, the Doraville and Atlanta markets have about 13 percent retail vacancy rate.

**Retail Demand**

This market analysis seeks to identify opportunities for new or expanded retail and business offerings within the study area. The primary, demand-side tool to determine this opportunity is called retail leakage.

“Retail Leakage” refers to the difference between the retail expenditures of residents living in a particular area and the retail sales produced by the stores located in the same area. If desired products are not available within that area, consumers will travel to other places or use different methods to obtain those products. Consequently, the dollars spent outside of the area are said to be “leaking.” Doraville’s market shows a net gain of retail dollars, meaning that store sales outpace the residents’ capacity to buy, suggesting that Doraville is a retail magnet that draws consumers in. This is true for the study area, City of Doraville, 10-minute, and 20-minute trade areas.

- LCI Study Area - $136,143,268 gain in all retail categories
- City of Doraville - $242,678,602 in gain
- 10-Minute Drive - $2,060,466,754 gain
- 20-Minute Drive - $7,378,781,332 gain

Because of this, and based on the fact that there is such a tremendous amount of developed and available space in the immediate region, the current market shows limited opportunity for any significant new retail,

**Table 2.10: Retail Leakage in Doraville, its Trade Areas, and Surrounding Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Gap - Retail Stores</th>
<th>LCI Leakage (Inflow)</th>
<th>Doraville Leakage (Inflow)</th>
<th>10-min PTA Leakage (Inflow)</th>
<th>20-min STA Leakage (Inflow)</th>
<th>Dekalb Leakage (Inflow)</th>
<th>ATL MSA Leakage (Inflow)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Sales</td>
<td>(136,143,268)</td>
<td>(242,678,602)</td>
<td>(2,060,466,754)</td>
<td>(7,378,781,332)</td>
<td>2,840,021,269</td>
<td>280,198,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers</td>
<td>(109,700,840)</td>
<td>(109,055,997)</td>
<td>(467,860,946)</td>
<td>(2,455,251,102)</td>
<td>568,263,725</td>
<td>(444,942,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings</td>
<td>(842,789)</td>
<td>(10,014,352)</td>
<td>(128,597,430)</td>
<td>(447,721,937)</td>
<td>99,132,694</td>
<td>(192,968,267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Appliance</td>
<td>(1,786,074)</td>
<td>(24,676,551)</td>
<td>(186,940,442)</td>
<td>(322,362,964)</td>
<td>(61,888,736)</td>
<td>69,464,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material, Garden Equip</td>
<td>(2,982,654)</td>
<td>(26,067,066)</td>
<td>(538,691,546)</td>
<td>(507,736,066)</td>
<td>363,563,792</td>
<td>(1,074,956,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage</td>
<td>(4,956,058)</td>
<td>(38,532,812)</td>
<td>(252,709,425)</td>
<td>(741,126,694)</td>
<td>(257,667,414)</td>
<td>(279,959,249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care</td>
<td>(1,236,490)</td>
<td>735,427</td>
<td>52,694,772</td>
<td>96,722,165</td>
<td>139,031,009</td>
<td>628,757,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>285,860</td>
<td>(19,041,742)</td>
<td>(89,453,481)</td>
<td>171,655,803</td>
<td>227,351,053</td>
<td>322,848,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories</td>
<td>105,903</td>
<td>123,029</td>
<td>(24,820,901)</td>
<td>(784,357,804)</td>
<td>220,969,124</td>
<td>(330,152,359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, Music</td>
<td>(267,690)</td>
<td>(1,931,830)</td>
<td>(30,678,356)</td>
<td>(190,246,980)</td>
<td>89,272,665</td>
<td>(49,797,114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>2,094,618</td>
<td>6,955,583</td>
<td>(156,184,882)</td>
<td>10,083,208</td>
<td>530,700,667</td>
<td>932,983,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>(1,353,575)</td>
<td>(3,877,467)</td>
<td>(50,772,599)</td>
<td>(132,148,521)</td>
<td>61,902,908</td>
<td>(255,270,668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Store Retailers</td>
<td>(14,383,396)</td>
<td>(12,652,498)</td>
<td>(42,141,054)</td>
<td>(408,163,428)</td>
<td>518,958,696</td>
<td>1,562,302,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodservice and Drinking Places</td>
<td>(1,120,083)</td>
<td>(4,642,326)</td>
<td>(144,310,464)</td>
<td>(1,668,127,011)</td>
<td>340,431,086</td>
<td>(608,111,969)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arnett Muldrow & Associates, Claritas Inc., and ULI’s Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers
particularly in the short-term. Ultimately, the ability to attract any significant retail development will require a development that is a destination, drawing consumers from a broader market including the Atlanta MSA and perhaps beyond.

Within the local markets (10-minute and 20-minute drive), there are a handful of categories that do show leakage. Of course, Doraville cannot reasonably expect to capture all retail sales leaving its trade area, but with strategic recruitment, economic development, and marketing, it could capture between 10 and 20 percent of dollars leaking the 10-minute primary trade area, and between 5 and 10 percent of that leaking the 20-minute secondary trade area.

Based on the leakage study and capture scenario, Doraville’s Trade Areas currently could support between 58,899 and 117,798 square feet of additional retail space, primarily in the categories of household appliances, hardware, and health & personal care. This amount of demand is marginal at best, and suggests that new retail development would have to draw from a larger market. Additional categories with leakage are shown in table 2.10.

Retail Observations

- Doraville and its trade areas are a regional retail center. There is inflow in most categories, with the majority being auto sales.
- There is limited local demand in Doraville for pharmacy, general merchandising, and clothing, yet the majority of demand is absorbed in the larger trade area regions.
- Within the immediate local trade areas, there is marginal demand for additional retail space of about 118,000 square feet. This is due primarily to the regional retail offerings in Doraville and surrounding areas.
- Any new significant retail would need to be a destination, drawing from the larger metro region.
- The Atlanta metro retail market is at 13 percent vacancy and still showing signs of contraction. The soft market coupled with the considerable amount retail space (including planned space) within Doraville’s market, there is likely limited opportunity for new retail in the short term.
Housing Market

The housing market analysis projects demand for new housing units, price points, and types over the next ten years in the greater Doraville area. Currently, Doraville has a median occupied housing unit value of $155,913, compared to $220,858 for the 20-minute trade area and $239,227 for the 10-minute trade area. Doraville and the study area rank in the lower third of regional housing unit value, while Dunwoody and Sandy Springs are at the top, with values more than double that of Doraville.

Doraville lies in northern DeKalb County, but in the heart of the three county area formed by DeKalb, Fulton and Gwinnett. The current Georgia MLS indicates that there are 4,229 for-sale listings in DeKalb County with average price point of $234,185. In Gwinnett County, there are 5,850 units at an average price of $233,405. In Fulton, there are 6,221 units at an average price of $438,036. In the past year, average sales prices mirror the values above, with Fulton at $218,413, Gwinnett at $167,518, and DeKalb at $152,018.

There are currently 154 new units for sale in DeKalb, and 424 in Fulton. In both counties, the majority of housing units for sale are between $100,000 and $300,000.

Demand projections for housing are based on past trends, and show a growing need for housing units. The numbers in table 2.14 represent demand for the entire 20-minute trade area. A portion of this demand could potentially be directed into the study area.

Currently within the 20-minute trade area, 47.1 percent of housing is owner-occupied, 46.7 percent is rental, and 6.2 percent is vacant. Ten-year projections show an annual demand in the trade area of 8,113 occupied units (3,173 owner and 4,940 renter).

Of the 3,173 owner-occupied units, 57 percent of the annual demand (1,798 units) will be for prices between $200,000 and $300,000, while an additional 18 percent (565 units) will be between $300,000 and $400,000. There is limited demand projected for homes less than $150,000.

Within the 20-minute trade area projections for single-family detached units amount to 47 percent (3,830 units) of annual demand over the next ten years. Projections are lower for condominiums and townhouses, at just 479 units per year. About

Figure 2.12: 2010 Median Housing Unit Value

Source: Arnett Muldrow & Associates, Claritas Inc.
46 percent of annual demand is for multifamily units, with nearly 25 percent of this for apartment of 5 to 19 units. The current median monthly rent is $706.

Estimates and projections for the study area suggest that it could support about 471 housing units over the next ten years. This equates to about 47 units per year. This estimate is based on the current year percentage of housing units in Doraville, as compared to that of the 20-minute trade area.

Much of the ability to attract housing to the study area will depend on development that meets the regional demand in terms of unit type, price, and character. Similar to the retail demand mentioned previously, a signature development could potentially draw from a larger region, or capture a higher percentage of the regional residential growth.
Of course, these projections are based on trends from the past 15 years. As such, they likely do not fully account for the nation’s current housing slump, especially in the Atlanta area. A look at ten years of building permits in Fulton and DeKalb show a dramatic decrease in housing construction. Fulton showed significant growth through 2005, with a sharp drop from 2007 and beyond. According to Census figures, there were just 775 single-family building permits in Fulton County in 2009, compared to 9,581 in 2005. Fulton had an additional 754 multifamily units in 2009. DeKalb shows a similar trend, yet with a decline beginning in 2002. Last year, the Census showed just 295 single-family and 28 multifamily building permits in DeKalb. These figures are far less than census trends show, suggesting that the area’s true growth potential may not be in the short-term.

**Housing Observations:**

- The current year housing market in Doraville’s 20-minute trade area shows that 41.8 percent of units are owner-occupied, 46.5 percent are renter occupied, and 11.6 percent are vacant. The percentage of vacant units has doubled in the past 10 years. In the City of Doraville, 56 percent are rental.
- While the area is continuing to grow slowly, housing development has dropped significantly in the Atlanta region. Single-family construction has been declining since 2006 and multifamily since 2007.
- According to ARC’s 1st Quarter 2010 report:
  - Atlanta building permits were down 66 percent from 2008 to 2009. Of all major metropolitan areas nationwide, this is second only to New York.
  - Metro housing permits increased slightly each month in the first quarter of 2010, but 780 permits this past March is far short of 7,200 in May of 2006, the metro’s peak.
  - Home starts are virtually nonexistent, particularly as foreclosures continue to be in the market.
  - Home prices in 2010 are 23 percent lower than the high in July 2007, having continued to fall in each of the first three months of the first quarter. Standard & Poors reported on August 31st, that prices are up 2 percent from this time last year.
- Sales and rental prices have also been declining within the market.
- Still, while the total number of new units has seen declines, the area is projected to continue to see growth in housing units, albeit at a much slower rate.
- Projections suggest an increase in units, split evenly between single-family detached and multifamily units. Price points within the trade area show the majority in the range of $200,000 to $300,000 with declining demand for units under $150,000.

### Table 2.15: 20-minute Trade Area Housing Demand by Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied Units In Structure</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Total Annual Estimated Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>288,393</td>
<td>307,544</td>
<td>326,695</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>36,043</td>
<td>38,437</td>
<td>40,831</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>14,419</td>
<td>15,377</td>
<td>16,334</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>40,825</td>
<td>43,536</td>
<td>46,247</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>71,638</td>
<td>76,395</td>
<td>81,153</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>71,967</td>
<td>76,746</td>
<td>81,525</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 49</td>
<td>29,261</td>
<td>31,205</td>
<td>33,148</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or More</td>
<td>54,938</td>
<td>58,586</td>
<td>62,234</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>610,873</td>
<td>651,439</td>
<td>692,005</td>
<td>8,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Arnett Muldrow & Associates, US Census, ESRI*
Employment Trends

The Atlanta area has been hit particularly hard by ongoing economic conditions, with increased vacancies, lower rental rates, and decreasing absorption in office and industrial space. While manufacturing has been declining longer, much of Atlanta’s job losses have been sustained in the past four years. Doraville is a testament to this, as GM closed in 2008. The closing of the plant is the primary reason why Doraville’s job losses have outpaced the region. Still, while banking and real estate has continued to have issues in Atlanta, there are signs that point to recovery in the long term.

Current Market

The study area shows a major decrease in manufacturing jobs (as high as 3,200 in 2004) with just 585 jobs in 2009. By far, the highest percentage of jobs is in the retail (37.4%) and service (25%) Sectors. Within a 15-minute drive of Doraville, the figures show a slightly different pattern. The Service Sector (42.1%) has the highest number of jobs, followed by Retail (19.9%) and Finance (10.7%). Manufacturing jobs represent just 6 percent of this larger market.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment in the Atlanta MSA is 10.2 percent as of July 2010. This ranks 33rd out of 49 in terms of highest levels of unemployment in the larger metro areas in the United States. The 10.2 percent rate is the same as July of 2009. Georgia’s 2010 unemployment rate is currently 9.9 percent.

The ARC shows in their April 2010 Regional Snapshot a total job loss in the 20-county metro area from 2000 to 2009 to be approximately 1.7 percent, with the losses really being sustained in the 10-county core area. Also, while certain counties showed declining trends throughout the past decade, the total metro losses really occurred during the three previous years during the height of the recession. Between 2006 and 2009, the metro Atlanta region lost 127,758 jobs, or 5.5 percent.

ARC data goes on to present employment changes during this time period by individual county, noting:

- Fulton County lost 6 percent of its jobs since 2000 while DeKalb lost 15.3 percent. Gwinnett showed marginal a gain at 1.2 percent.
- Like the metro area, the majority of losses in these counties occurred in past four years, with Fulton losing 29,000 jobs, Gwinnett 27,000, and DeKalb 10,000.
- The Georgia 400 corridor showed some positive trends. This includes the ARC superdistrict in North DeKalb (Doraville)
  - North Fulton and South Forsyth had higher concentration of jobs in 2009.
  - Georgia 400 from Atlanta to Forsyth shows higher percentage of higher paying jobs sectors. (Finance, Information, Professional/Technical/Scientific, Wholesale Trade, Management)

While these estimates are shown through 2009, the ARC cites Bureau of Labor Statistic report of continued net job losses in Atlanta metro from 2008 to the current year.

Projections

The data are not all bad, a number of indicators, including ARC’s 2040 forecast show positive trends.

- Along with continued population growth, the ARC projects 1.6 million new jobs in the region by 2040. The highest growth sectors include:
  - Health Care & Social Assistance – 276,000 jobs by 2040
  - Professional & Technical – 257,000
  - Real Estate – 150,000
### Table 2.16: 2009 Employment by Sector in the LCI Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total Establishments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Sales (in Millions)</th>
<th>Establishments 20+ Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non classifiable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>531</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>645</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas, Inc.

### Table 2.17: 2009 Employment by Sector in the 15-Minute Drive Time Area (Source: Claritas, Inc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total Establishments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Sales (in Millions)</th>
<th>Establishments 20+ Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>22,842</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>45,889</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>40,546</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>36,001</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>9,769</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>152,113</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>18,999</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>81,597</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16,573</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22,765</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>321,315</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>35,547</td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>40,019</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non classifiable</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>15,931</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>762,591</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas, Inc.

### Table 2.18: Total Employment and Change from 1980 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atlanta Regional Commission

### Table 2.19: Job Growth by Occupation 2005-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Jobs 05-40</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Share 05</th>
<th>Share 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training, Library</td>
<td>97,368</td>
<td>163.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>162,684</td>
<td>102.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Social Service</td>
<td>43,205</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Landscape, personal care</td>
<td>162,569</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, math engineer</td>
<td>108,388</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, physical, social science</td>
<td>19,666</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Finance</td>
<td>163,902</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC Regional Snapshot. June 2009
Highest job growth by occupation include:
- Education – up 163 percent by 2040 with increased overall share
- Healthcare – up 103 percent by 2040
- Community & Social Service – up 92 percent by 2040
Declining jobs include agriculture, production/transportation, arts/entertainment, and sales/ office.

- In the first quarter report for 2010 published by ARC, a number of key economic indicators show positive momentum. While still losing jobs, the employment numbers for Construction and Manufacturing sectors are trending up. There was also a year over year increase in retail jobs.
- From its 2nd Quarter trends report, Grubb & Ellis notes:
  - There was positive office absorption (200,000 sf) in the second quarter of 2010. This is the 2nd quarter in a row with positive absorption, perhaps suggesting the office market has hit bottom.
  - On the other hand, rental rates still declining in both Class A and B office space and are currently at $23.28 & $17.85 respectively.
  - Construction activity is limited to medical office space and leasing activity to bio and life sciences, due to state incentives.
  - Positive industrial absorption (2.5 million sf) due to several specific move-ins.
  - Still, rental rates continued to decline to the current rates of $2.61 for general industrial, $6.91 for research and development flex, and $3.45 for warehouse & distribution.
  - While there was a net overall positive absorption in the metro, the Chamblee/Doraville/Norcross submarket showed continued negative absorption and 13.6 percent vacancy.
- The Atlanta Business Chronicle notes in its September 3-9 issue, that economists project that Atlanta will continue to be a desirable location for headquarters relocations in 2011 and 2012. In 2010, there were 12,700 jobs added due to headquarters, healthcare, data centers, back office, and digital media. The area is positioned to continue this trend, with healthcare and government adding the most jobs.
- Finally, Plan 2040 published by the ARC calls for growth to be concentrated around transit. Station Communities such as Doraville could support increased housing and job density.
Land Values

Land values also significantly impact redevelopment prospects in a community. To identify these impacts in Doraville a study was conducted that factored land costs into multifamily rental, for-sale housing, and mixed use redevelopment. Full details can be found in the Appendix.

By establishing a set of assumptions and extrapolating a range of variables, an acceptable range of land values under which a particular development type may be feasible was determined for the study area. Key findings include that:

- **Multifamily housing without structured parking** (30 units/acre or less) could be feasible where land values at or below $900,000 per acre (less demolition costs). This suggests that large portions of the study area could support such multifamily development based on land values alone.

- **Multifamily housing with structured parking** (generally 30 units/acre of more) may only be appropriate with land values at $600,000 acre or less due to the added parking and construction costs.

- **Conventional single-family housing** at five to seven units per acre could be built within areas of land value up to $400,000 per acre.

- **Small lot single-family housing** at could only be build on areas with land prices of no more than $300,000 per acre, due to a lower sale price per unit.

- **Townhouses** at 15 units per acre could occur on land as high as $900,000 per acre.

- **Commercial uses**, such as found along Buford Highway, can occur on land up to $700,000 per acre, depending on the specific franchise.

- **Mixed-Use development** could only pay $250,000 per acre.

Regarding the relatively low land values that mixed-use development could pay, conventional wisdom would have it that the uses combined in a mixed use development add value to both (or each) use through synergy and efficiency. While this may happen where pedestrian-oriented demand is robust and exceeds supply of available opportunities or where densities are exceedingly high - as in a high rise environment - in the earlier stages of redevelopment, the additional costs to design and build mixed-use projects tend to work against their economics, leaving a lower, rather than higher residual land value. Furthermore, the financial community tends to penalize mixed-use underwriting through higher capitalization rates and lower loan to value ratios-precisely because of the added costs and risks. As such, mixed-use development, especially on smaller sites, is less likely to lead redevelopment in an area with high land costs, but little ambiance.
Figure 2.14: County-Appraised Land Values
2.5 Urban Design & Historic Resources

Urban Design

Urban design is a comprehensive review of the collective patterns that define a community and the design opportunities that they represent. It looks at the physical impacts of the variety of factors that shape our communities, and evaluates their ability to create a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. A key component of urban design is the experience that a place provides. This experience is defined by a complex interaction of building, street, trees, sidewalks, topography, and many other physical features which work together to define “place” and establish physical character.

A key component of place is the public realm and its spatial form. Spatial form refers to the way in which the placement and massing of buildings work together to form a space greater than the individual buildings. Different spatial forms have different impacts on psychology and the ability of places to support activities. For example, most people like to feel protected while walking. This is best achieved by making them feel enclosed.

From a psychological point of view, a street with a height to width ratio of between 1:1 and 1:3 provides the necessary enclosure, irrespective of how tall the buildings are. Therefore, if there is a desire to create an environment where walking is encouraged, said street should respect these ratios. The existence or lack of enclosure also has a direct impact on driver behavior; all else being equal, buildings close to the street psychologically narrow it and result in slight decreases in vehicular speeds. It also contributes to a sense-of-place.

Existing Conditions

While the heart of Doraville at one time had a strong sense-of-place, the march of time has destroyed little of what could be considered positive urban design elements. Today virtually all of the study area is marked by the same post World War II development patterns found across the region. Elements of this include buildings with a low level of architectural detail set far from the street, frontal parking, visual clutter, little landscaping, and a lack of spatial enclosure. The result is that, other than the fact that many of the signs are in Korean, Spanish, or other languages, Doraville’s core resembles “Anywhere, USA.”

Fortunately, because much of the study area is ripe for redevelopment it offers an opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. In addition, there are several nearby examples of how redevelopment can enrich local identity, rather than destroy it, including recent projects in Chamblee and Decatur. These places can be models for how proactive communities can incrementally...
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Figure 2.15: Urban Design Analysis
use growth to enrich the local identity. More hopeful yet is that, compared to these places, the opportunity presented by the former GM plant is virtually limitless.

**Strengths**
- Nearby Decatur and Chamblee are models for how development can enrich local identity.
- A few pre World War II buildings present the street appropriately with storefronts or porches, and shallow setbacks.

**Weaknesses**
- There is a lack of street-oriented buildings.
- Auto-oriented buildings create the impression of “Anywhere, USA.”
- Visual clutter is found on many roads.
- There is a lack of public art in the study area.
- Major barriers separate different parts of the study area.

**Opportunities**
- The study area offers several highly visible visual termini that offer unique design opportunities.
- Large redevelopment sites could become master planned projects with a strong sense of place and good design.
- Zoning changes could improve the design quality of development.
- Landscaping could improve aesthetics.
- The study area’s large size could allow several different character areas to be developed.
- Building height could vary by location to reduce the visual impacts of taller buildings.
- Public art could be incorporated into new developments or public spaces.
- Several major gateways could welcome people to the area.
- Planned streetscape projects could improve aesthetics.
- Doraville’s high Hispanic population, which is culturally disposed to walkable, pedestrian-oriented urbanism and public spaces, could energize future public spaces with activity.

**Threats**
- Development could continue in a disjointed manner.
Figure 2.16: Existing Figure Ground Study

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.
Historic Resources

Preserving a community’s heritage is becoming increasingly important in today’s world of homogenous cities and towns. While only a few historic structures from before World War II exist within the study area, it does include several examples of early postwar commercial buildings and nearby neighborhoods. In addition, the study area includes other features such as mature trees, graves, and even industrial “relics” that should be investigated as candidates for preservation. Incorporating such features into developments can provide the sense of “authenticity” that many long for.

Strengths
• Several historic houses and businesses recall earlier times.
• Many historic or “legacy” trees exist throughout the study area.
• The Prosperity Cemetery preserves local family history.
• Many Post World War II buildings exist in the study area

Weaknesses
• Many potentially historic buildings have been modified or are in a state of disrepair.
• Little remains of Doraville’s historic core.

Opportunities
• Architecture could build upon local or regional precedents, rather than simple corporate prototypes.
• Historic features, including industrial “relics” could be incorporated into new developments.

Threats
• The loss of the study area’s few historic buildings could further degrade its history.

At one time Doraville had a traditional downtown, but it was destroyed to make way for the MARTA Station (Source: Barré, Laura and Ken. The History of Doraville. Roswell, GA: Wolf Publishing, 1995)
2.6 Public Facilities & Spaces

Today many services are provided by local, state, and federal governments, or private companies. These include basic facilities public health, safety, and welfare, as well as additional services that make a community an inviting place to live or do businesses. Examples of the latter include open spaces, which are becoming an important development strategy in some places.

Public Facilities

Within the study area a variety of public facilities exist, including
- Doraville Library, a branch of the DeKalb County Public Library system offering community events and classes
- The Doraville Civic Center, a space for special events held by residents and community groups
- A pool, located in Flowers Park and run by the City
- The Doraville Police Department
- Three fire stations (#15, #18 and #19) run by the County, but serving Doraville and the study area

In addition, there are several nearby schools:
- Hightower Elementary School (DeKalb County)
- Cary Reynolds Elementary School (DeKalb County)
- Sequoyah Middle School (DeKalb County)
- Yeshiva Atlanta (a private high school serving Jewish students)

The area also contains several private facilities that serve the public, including churches, and the Center for Pan Community Services. The closest hospitals are little over three miles to the west and include Northside Hospital, Children’s Healthcare of Atlanta at Scottish Right, and Saint Joseph Hospital.

Strengths
- Many public facilities exist in the study area.
- Doraville’s small population means that its residents can influence City facilities more than residents of larger communities.
- Code enforcement is strong, but could still be improved.

Weaknesses
- There are reports of safety concerns along Buford Highway.
- Schools are a challenge to attracting families with children.

Opportunities
- Master-planned redevelopments could include new facilities.

Threats
- Growth without facility expansion and improvements could strain existing resources and reduce quality.
Public Spaces

Reliance on technology and fast-paced lifestyles leads people to increasingly value places that allow them to connect with others. In fact, one of today’s hottest real estate trends is the community where people can partake in a wide variety of public spaces on a daily basis. Many people no longer want to drive to walk down a pleasant, tree-lined sidewalk, play in a park with their children, or relax on a warm summer evening. They want their communities to provide all of these opportunities and more.

There are five major categories of public spaces, each with their own distinct definition and applicability:

**Streets and sidewalks** are the most used public spaces in towns and cities. In addition to serving as a transportation conduit, streets and sidewalks can be designed to encourage social interaction and community building. Streets can be parade routes or the location of special festivals, while in-town sidewalks can provide room for cafe dining, street furniture, and street trees.

**Plazas** are hardscaped gathering places in a town or city center and surrounded by commercial, mixed-use, or civic buildings. They often include fountains, benches, or similar elements. Their entire surface is accessible to the public and consists of stone, concrete, or pavement interspersed with trees and limited plant materials.

**Parks** are landscaped recreation and gathering places that can be located in any area of a town or city. They may be surrounded by residential or commercial buildings, and are often the focal points of neighborhoods. Parks often include picnic facilities, drinking fountains, benches, and playgrounds. Larger parks may include ponds, sports fields, and courts. Well designed parks are defined at the edges by streets, lawns, shrubs, and other plant materials.

**Greenways** are parks that can serve as corridors for transportation, wildlife migration, or protection of key habitats that occur in a linear manner, such as the zones along creeks and rivers. Greenways can also connect plazas, parks and conservation lands. Because of this, they can be located in virtually any setting and with any size.

**Conservation Lands** protect and enhance areas of environmental and historic significance. They are usually located at the edge of a town or city. Because their primary purpose is the protection of open space, they can include camping sites and trails.

**Existing Conditions**

Public space conditions in the study area today are poor. There are no true parks, plazas, greenways, or conservation areas. The only park that does exist, Flowers Park, is little more than a bench and a
few swings amongst a treed embankment behind the police station. At one time the park was larger, but subsequent development of public facilities reduced it to its current size. In addition, the area’s major streets and sidewalks are impoverished public spaces that only serve drivers. Minor streets are only slightly better, in large part because they retain vestiges of the area’s past, including mature trees that provide shade and greenery.

With redevelopment, an opportunity exists to enrich the study area’s public realm. New developments could incorporate pedestrian friendly streets and plazas, while existing stream corridors, such as Bubbling Creek, could become greenways. Buildings could be placed in a way that enriches these spaces, rather than turning their backs on them. Without such facilities, however, redevelopment will only continue to degrade the study area’s public realm.

**Strengths**

- Some secondary streets, such as Shallowford Road, are lined with trees on adjacent properties

**Weaknesses**

- There is no study area park, plaza, or other gathering space.
- Streets and sidewalks fail to serve as meaningful public spaces.
- Litter and weeds in streets and sidewalks make much of the public realm appear neglected.

**Opportunities**

- New developments could provide public spaces, including plazas that could be a focal point or “town center.”
- Stream corridors and flood zones could become greenways.
- Street trees could enhance the public realm.
- A Vietnam War memorial could be incorporated into the area.

**Threats**

- Development could occur without appropriate or well-placed public spaces.
- Poorly designed public spaces might lack appeal and fail to capitalize on the need for a community focal point.
- Liability and limited funds, which could limit the ability to provide publicly-owned open spaces.
- Poorly located open spaces could result when open spaces are relegated to the areas with least development potential.
- Maintenance of public spaces could be a long-term challenge.
2.7 Lifelong Communities

Lifelong communities are places where people of all abilities can live throughout their lifetime. Components that make a community a place where individuals can age in place successfully include a range of housing and transportation options (including a connected and walkable environment), opportunities that encourage healthy lifestyles, and access to supportive services and information.

Existing Conditions

Greater Doraville is a place where people of all ages and abilities live, but it lacks many amenities and characteristics that are important for an aging population or those with physical disabilities. Table 2.20 shows the study area’s performance in a variety of Lifelong Communities measures established by the ARC. These are grouped for consideration during the planning process.

Many principles of Lifelong Communities involve the ability of the transportation system to support mobility and accessibility, especially for non-drivers. As identified in Section 2.3 Transportation, the area today is difficult and inconvenient to walk in, both due to a lack of safe facilities, but also development patterns favoring drivers.

A second set of principles involves providing a range of accessible dwellings. Unfortunately, the study area performs poorly in this category, as well, in that it fails to provide housing for those of a variety of ages, incomes, and lifestyles. This limits its appeal and means that there are few options for residents of nearby single-family neighborhoods to down-size to other housing types as they age, unless they choose to move out of the area.

Social interaction between people of all ages and abilities is also key to Lifelong Communities. In Doraville this occurs primarily in semi-public settings such as restaurants or religious facilities. A few encounters also occur in parking lots or at public buildings.

The study area does provide some support for healthy living, including a pool and many places selling healthy foods. Unfortunately the community is largely laid out in a way that discourages informal physical activity that is part of daily life.

The final element of Lifelong Communities is access to services. In this category parts of the study area come close to achieving Lifelong Communities principles. Those living near Buford Highway have access to a range of daily goods and services, especially those targeting Asians and Hispanics. During field work conducted as part of this study, several people were seen walking from nearby apartments to said businesses.
### Table 2.20: Lifelong Communities Assessment of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifelong Communities Principle</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets that are welcoming and unintimidating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming strategies that make the environment feel safe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantings and fencing positioned to reduce traffic noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging frontages that include diverse urban and building form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable/fall-safe sidewalks</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage sidewalks during any construction and repair to avoid access barriers</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage sidewalks to avoid cluttering of pedestrian environment</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level changes that are clearly marked and well-lit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handrails installed where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb cuts at all intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian friendly sidewalk paving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees for shade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory cues at decision points, such as junctions or grade changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate pedestrian lighting</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossable streets</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation for specialized vehicles (power chairs, golf carts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting arrangements to provide respite and facilitate conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturdy seating with arm and back rests, made of appropriate materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered bus stops with seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of sun and shade considered in the design of the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates/doors requiring less than 5 lbs of pressure to open &amp; having lever handles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration given to required vegetative buffers and pedestrian access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration given to parking requirements and pedestrian access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized transit waiting areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit stops that provide protection from rain, wind and sun</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart transit technology that alerts riders to bus/shuttle’s arrival time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart transit technology alerts bus drivers to riders waiting out of sight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops for shuttles, jitneys, buses and light rail</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of housing (varying sizes, products)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of housing products</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce housing</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of supportive housing types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of specialized housing types (cohousing, models that address disabilities)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible spaces as appropriate based on community accessibility standards</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard gardens, porches and stoops</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement of found gathering places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community rooms (large enough for exercise classes, meetings, movies)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for meaningful volunteer activities (e.g. after-school tutoring)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and passive open space such as dog parks, playgrounds, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-places such as parks, shops, community centers, etc.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily needs within safe and inviting walking distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-safe environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter block sizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable destinations</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated walking loop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and recreation venues (e.g. bocce, dancing, tennis, yoga, tai chi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community equipped with access to health services and education</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community concierge (and case management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood access to healthy foods</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community bulletin boards</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding signage</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local access to ordinary daily needs that are location appropriate</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes, this principle is met
- No, this principle is not met
- This principle is partially met
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3.1 Public Process

The 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI utilized a number of public outreach tools and techniques to solicit community involvement from nearly 300 people between August 2010 and March 2011. These included interviews, core team meetings, public notices, an image preference survey, a community charrette, three public presentations, and a website.

Interviews and Surveys

At the beginning of the study the consultant team used anonymous one-on-one interviews and on-line surveys so that stakeholders could share their thoughts on the area as it is today, as well as its future potential. Participants included residents, developers, community leaders, local officials, and representatives of organizations in and around the study area. In total, 124 people participants offered their thoughts. Their efforts provided key input into both the inventory and analysis phase of the plan, and the creation of its recommendations.

The Core Team

To guide the planning process and to facilitate outreach, a Core Team of stakeholders was also established early in the study process. The Core Team consisted of property owners and developers, elected officials, Chamblee staff, DeKalb County staff, MARTA, GDOT, GRTA, business owners, neighborhood leaders, and other leaders within the community. Nearly 60 people either expressed interest in the Core Team or were invited to participate.

The Core Team met four times during the planning process. The following are brief summaries of these meetings:

- **Core Team Meeting #1** (August 16, 2010): At this meeting the consultants introduced the process to the Core Team, defined the Core Team’s role, provided an update on inventory work, and answered planning process questions.
- **Core Team Meeting #2** (September 13, 2010): At this meeting final inventory findings were presented, preliminary ideas for bridging the MARTA and freight rail were reviewed, and the upcoming workshop was discussed.
- **Core Team Meeting #3** (October 19, 2010): At this meeting the consultant team presented ideas discussed at the community workshop for review and comment. This included a preliminary Framework Plan, rough GM and Town Center concepts, and emerging market and economic development ideas.
- **Core Team Meeting #4** (March 15, 2011): At this meeting consultants provided an overview of next steps and implementation efforts, and answered outstanding questions. The Core Team also voted to support plan adoption.
Summary of Survey Comments

Following completion of stakeholder interviews and surveys, a Wordle was prepared for strengths, challenges, and opportunities. A Wordle is a tool for generating “word clouds” from text that give greater prominence to words that appear more frequently in the source text. Wordles can be used to quickly and graphically identify major themes.

Study Area Strengths Wordle

Study Area Challenges Wordle

Study Area Opportunities Wordle
Public Meetings

In addition to the Core Team meetings, four public meetings were held to ensure that all interested parties were given an opportunity to be involved in shaping the community’s future. Summaries of these meetings are provided below. Complete agendas are available in the Appendix.

Kickoff Meeting

On August 16, 2010, a public meeting was held at the Doraville Civic Center to commence the public portion of the planning effort. The meeting began with an exercise that allowed participants to put red and green dots on a map to show where they thought negative and positive things were happening. Following this, attendees were introduced to the project team, the LCI program, the planning process, current planning principles, and LCI successes in other communities. As the meeting closed, participants were given an opportunity to visit different stations to share their thoughts on transportation, housing/marketing, land use, and other issues. They were asked to tell the project team what they liked most and least in the study area, as well as specific needs for change.

Workshop

Through an evening charrette held at the Hightower Elementary School on September 22, 2010, the consultant team shared the results of inventory work and the image preference survey with attendees. They then conducted breakout sessions to further define the community’s desires on seven different topics: the GM Assembly site, the MARTA/town center area, market and economic development, area-wide land use and design, area-wide transportation, community linkages, and sustainability and open space.

Specifically, workshop attendees brainstormed various ideas for each topic, encouraged not to limit their thoughts at this point in the planning effort. At the conclusion of the sessions, a representative for each topic presented the highlights of the ideas discussed.

Draft Plan Open House

The draft master plan recommendations were made at an open house held on January 26, 2011, at the Doraville Civic Center. At the meeting, boards showing all plan recommendations were available for review and comment; this informal format allowed participants to focus on the areas of most interest to them. In addition, they could share their most and least-liked recommendations with the consultant team, and fill out a detailed worksheet with specific comments. Following the open house, materials and the worksheet were also available on-line for review through February 18, 2011.
Final Plan Presentation

The final master plan recommendations were presented to the public on March 2, 2011. At this meeting, comments on the plan were heard and later incorporated into the finished plan document.

Other Meetings and Presentations

Supplemental presentations were also made at various points in the planning process. These included presentations to the Chamblee Business Association and MARTA.

Individual meetings were also held with area stakeholders at various points to discuss specific project concerns and ideas.

Communication Tools

Recognizing the importance of communication to the public involvement efforts, the planning effort utilized a number of tools to keep stakeholders informed of upcoming meetings and project information.

One critical tool was the project website, which provided access to the project maps, meeting presentations, meeting minutes, flyers, plan documents, and other information pertaining to the study. The website also included an online listserv which was used to keep members updated on the planning process.

In addition to the website, various print media were distributed to inform residents and property owners of upcoming meetings. Flyers were posted at area businesses, government buildings, and other high traffic locations to inform the community of upcoming events; these were printed in English, but included phone numbers to request further information in Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. Core Team members also assisted in spreading the word through word-of-mouth and neighborhood associations.
3.2 Image Preference Survey

A key visioning tool of the Doraville Town Center Master LCI Study was the use of an image preference survey (IPS). Using an online format accessed from the project website, the public was given the opportunity to score a variety of images for their level of appropriateness for the future of the study area. Categories included Transportation, Parks and Open Space, Retail and Restaurants, Mixed-Uses, Multifamily Housing, and Townhouses/Single-Family Houses. Possible scores ranged from -5 (extremely inappropriate) to +5 (extremely appropriate). A score of 0 indicated no preference.

The IPS was available on-line from August 16, 2010, to September 19, 2010, and was completed by 42 people. Demographic information collected during the survey indicated:

- 32% of respondents lived in the LCI study area
- 38% lived in the City of Doraville (excluding the study area)
- 5% lived in the City of Chamblee
- 20% lived somewhere else in DeKalb County
- 5% lived outside of DeKalb County

Following the survey, the most and least appropriate images were identified by taking the average (mean) score for each image. In addition, agreement between respondents was determined by looking at the standard deviation of image scores. The following summarizes key findings.

Transportation

Transportation images showed many different facilities, including roadways, bicycle lanes or tracks, multi-use paths, sidewalks, pedestrian bridges and tunnels, rail transit, buses, and more. Except for two images showing missing sidewalks in the study area, all images in this category received positive scores, suggesting that people want to expand the range of transportation offerings.

The top rated images in this category showed a strong desire for well-designed, pedestrian-friendly, multi-modal facilities, especially safe and user-friendly sidewalks and multi-use paths. Among the latter, there was even support for the idea of a path in the middle of a street, something that exists nowhere in the region. For sidewalks, images that scored better than others were those showing street trees, landscaping and on-street parking to buffer pedestrians from traffic.

Finally, in the scope of all the images used in this survey, it is important to note that the two images that scored highest in this category were also the highest-scoring ones in the survey. This suggests that transportation improvements are a high priority for the community.
This image category showed a series of open spaces ranging from parks and plazas, to curb markets and community gardens. The study area currently lacks such facilities, but survey responses suggest a desire to increase the amount of quality open space in the future. To this end, all images in this category scored well.

It is of note that the highest scoring image in this category was of a lively plaza in a mixed-use setting; this image is shown at right. Another image that scored high was of the community park at Glenwood Park in Atlanta. This park, shown at right below, is not only a neighborhood focal point, but also serves as a stormwater retention pond and infiltration area during major rain events. A third notable image was of an amphitheater in Duluth, Georgia.

This category also included images of community gardens, which are becoming popular around the nation. Though favored in Doraville, they did not rank as high as other types of open spaces, probably because people do not see them as a long-term aspiration, but rather a temporary use.

**Retail and Restaurants**

There are currently many stores and restaurants in the study area, especially along Buford Highway, whose diversity and unique services draw many customers from outside the city. However, they are all auto-oriented and not easy to access on foot. The survey results suggest a desire to improve and expand these offerings in a mixed-use, compact, and pedestrian-friendly setting.

Within this category the highest scoring images were those of businesses located on the ground floor of mixed-use buildings with sidewalk activity. High scoring images included tree-covered cafe dining in Portland, Oregon, and the village center of the Vickery.
neighborhood in Cumming, Georgia. Although the scale and design of these places are drastically different, both provide quality buildings, a pleasant walking experience, and cafe dining. Both are also human-scaled spaces with a strong sense of place.

This category also included images of food trucks, which are becoming increasingly popular across the nation. While welcomed in many communities, they appear to not be favored here, with an average score of -1.93. The verdict on food trucks is still out, however, as many people ranked them extremely high, even though the overall score was still negative.

**Mixed-Use**

A key element of the LCI program is the promotion of mixed-use development, both vertically and horizontally. However, in the greater Doraville community survey responses suggest a desire to ensure that mixed-use development is also well designed and pedestrian friendly. To this end, the two highest scoring mixed-use images were of the Edgewood Retail District in Atlanta and downtown Smyrna, Georgia. These images showed two and three story traditionally-styled brick and clapboard buildings containing shops, housing, and offices. More significantly, they included green space and landscaping that minimized the visual impact of the higher density development.

Images of modern building designs and tall buildings (six stories and up) received less agreement, but appear to generally still be favored in parts of the study area. In comparison, an existing low-rise, vaguely traditional mixed-use building on New Peachtree Road was the only image scoring negative in this category.

Overall, the survey confirmed that there is a role for high-quality, higher density mixed-use development in the study area’s future.
Multifamily

The study area currently has two aging multifamily apartment complexes serving low-income residents, and no for-sale condominiums. The survey results suggest a desire to redevelop existing complexes into higher-quality multifamily housing, as well as increasing such in other parts of the study area. The survey did not ask if such housing should be owner-occupied or rental, nor whether it should have an affordable housing component, but concurrent stakeholder interviews generally expressed support for a mixture of types, provided they were well-designed.

The survey was very effective in defining what character new multifamily housing should take. The highest scoring images showed buildings with porches, stoops, and interesting facades. The least appropriate images were those of conventional, suburban multifamily complexes with large frontal parking areas and little landscaping. Among the latter was a photo of one of the two existing apartment complexes in the study area.

Townhouses/Single Family

As the region’s population ages and residents choose to downsize from their big-lot single-family houses, townhouse and small-lot single-family houses are expected to become an increasingly popular housing option, especially in and near activity centers. While these options in the study area will be limited, there may be opportunities for such uses as part of large, master planned developments.

If townhouses and single-family houses are ever provided, survey results suggest that the conventional approach to cookie-cutter houses that provide higher density living, but without the amenities that make it desirable (including parks, sidewalks, and a true “town” environment) are inappropriate for the future of the study area.
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Both townhouse and single family images that scored well were of traditional or modern facades with quality design features and small landscaped yards. These homes fronted on tree-lined sidewalks, and alluded to a setting that was truly walkable. Parking was provided, but to the rear of buildings so as to not disrupt the pedestrian-oriented building front.

**General Findings**

The images selected as most appropriate represent places from around the nation; regardless of origin, all share certain design elements. Most notable is that all show a vibrant, human-scaled downtown environment; survey participants rejected the images of sprawling suburban areas and endless high-rise canyons equally. Furthermore, all share a common respect for the pedestrian, landscaping, and well-designed buildings. Another key indication is that people think the study area should provide facilities that serve a range of people. This is reflected in terms of business types, housing types, open space types, transportation facilities, and architectural styles.

Results also suggest that the residents, businesses, and property owners in and around the study area are yearning for a place that is different from what has been offered in recent decades, and that the area has the opportunity to become a vibrant mixed-use center. While much talk recently has focused on the potential to achieve this on the former GM site, survey results suggest the entire area has the opportunity to redevelop into a new growth model for the city and the region by offering something different. Namely, it could become a high quality, mixed-use town center with transit-oriented development and improved connectivity and accessibility, as well as expanding its diversity and uniqueness. In this way the entire study area would truly be improved, rather than focusing improvement into one or two key sites.
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4.1 Overview of Recommendations

This part of the document includes recommendations for the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI study area that proactively shape its future character and provide short and long-range actions to address the weaknesses and threats identified in Part 2: Inventory & Analysis. Two types of recommendations are provided: Policies and Projects. Projects are followed by a project number as identified in Section 5.1: Action Plan, which contains an implementation strategy, including cost, funding, and responsible parties.

Recommendations are a synthesis of the desires and work of area residents, businesses, property owners, the project Core Team, and others, coupled with sound planning principles. They offer a visionary yet achievable blueprint for sustainable growth that will benefit Doraville and nearby communities for decades to come.

Future Vision

This LCI study is an unprecedented opportunity for the greater Doraville community to plan for the area including and surrounding the shuttered Doraville Assembly Plant. The plant’s redevelopment and its ripple effects provide opportunities to connect diverse communities, fill housing and economic voids, foster quality growth, and expand public space. The plan strives to capitalize on these opportunities and ensure that future redevelopment benefits Doraville, surrounding communities, and the region.

The recommendations that follow have been developed to realize a vision that emerged from an open and inclusive planning process. Central to this is a belief that poorly planned development practices must be shunned in favor of a thoughtful and integrated approach to land use, transportation, economic development, design, and public facilities - one that builds on Doraville’s strengths to create a place of lasting economic, social, and environmental value.

As the area redevelops, it is envisioned as becoming both a revitalized heart for Doraville and a key employment and major activity center for northeast Atlanta, with a growth pattern that is:

- **Compact**: Offering different uses close to one another, preferably within a ten minute walk.
- **Connected**: Providing pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle, and transit facilities that allow easy access between uses.
- **Complex**: Striving for diversity in the mix of uses, economic resilience, the range of housing, and the design of buildings and public spaces. Failure to do this creates monotony, and places that are monotonous are not of lasting value.

In general, this means providing a mix of employment, housing, retail, civic, and open spaces connected by a balanced system of streets, transit, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities. It also means

---

**Policies & Projects**

There are two types of plan recommendations:

- **Policies** are guidelines that provide direction for the implementation of the plan’s vision. They often support specific implementation projects and should be the basis for actions by the cities of Doraville and Chamblee. Policies should also guide the private sector, especially to the extent that they define plan aspirations.

- **Projects** are specific tasks, such as transportation improvements or new parks, with a defined cost and time frame. They are often undertaken by a local agency such as the City of Doraville, City of Chamblee, GDOT, or MARTA.
arranging them in a way that creates a place where people want to live, work, and play, both today and in the coming decades. Most importantly, it means doing so in a way that promotes and expands Doraville’s diversity of residents and businesses.

More specifically, the land use vision calls for ordering redevelopment into five character areas. Due to its large size, it is not feasible to expect the study area to redevelop with a single identity. However, by establishing different areas based on transportation access, environmental factors, and location, it is possible to create a framework that can accommodate the range of different development patterns desired by stakeholders.

Envisioned character areas include:

- **The GM Site**, which is envisioned as a model for sustainable transit-oriented development (TOD) next to the Doraville MARTA station. The new neighborhood will offer opportunities for corporate office and research facilities, sidewalk shopping, and a mix of housing types within a walkable and green urban setting.

- **Doraville Town Center**, which surrounds Doraville’s existing City Hall, and is inspired by the historic downtown that Doraville once had. It features a mix of human-scaled buildings surrounding a proposed village green.

- **Technology Village**, which lies west of the GM site and provides a focus for research and development, light manufacturing, and high technology uses requiring horizontal buildings.

- **Buford Highway**, which provides ethnically diverse highway-oriented commercial within a more pedestrian-oriented format than currently exists.

- **Peachtree Boulevard**, which continues to offers highway-oriented commercial uses, including major car dealerships.

Of these, the degree of intensity, walkability, and mix of uses is envisioned as greatest at the GM Site and within the Doraville Town Center. The three remaining character areas are envisioned as less intense, primarily commercial ones in areas ill-suited for residential uses or highly walkable development patterns.

Serving and connecting these character areas, a range of new transportation facilities is envisioned. These include sidewalks, multi-use paths, and new streets which serve the immediate community. They also include new facilities that create regional connections, including rail transit, and a regional roadway connecting Buford Highway to Peachtree Boulevard.

In all areas, the design of buildings, streets, and open spaces should to create a memorable place where people want to be. Buildings should use lasting materials and strive for architectural excellence, while public art and lush landscaping are envisioned throughout.
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Figure 4.1: Character Areas

Note:
This graphic is for illustrative purposes only. It is intended to show one possible option for long-term area build-out.
4.2 Land Use Recommendations

The large amount of marginal lands in the study area represents an opportunity to proactively plan for change. As market forces increasingly favor areas served by transit, the area should grow in a way that increases the mix of uses, particularly those creating high-paying jobs, serving the aging population, or enhancing available goods and services. This must occur in a way that minimizes negative environmental impacts and improves the area’s quality-of-life.

Land Use Policies

*Use the Framework Plan as a guide for long term redevelopment, while recognizing that interim growth may be less intense than reflected in the plan.*

The Framework Plan in Figure 4.2 reflects aspirations for how the area should grow over the next 25 years to become a revitalized heart for Doraville and a model for sustainable development. Central to this is a land use vision that provides opportunities for everything from townhouses to high rise offices and condominiums. The plan’s goal is that people of all incomes and ages will be able to live, work, and play in the area, with all the necessary supporting services such as schools, parks, and places of worship within a short walk.

Before this aspiration can be achieved, it is likely that some sites, especially former industrial ones, could be utilized for interim uses such as adaptive reuse of existing buildings or less intense development. Such should not be viewed as a failure of the plan, but rather one step in the natural, incremental growth of the area.

**Promote mixed-use, transit oriented development that includes sizable employment on land west of the MARTA line and on the former GM site.**

Current and former industrial uses in this area represent a significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: Description of Typical Framework Plan Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mixed-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Mixed-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to lower heights is within the PDK Approach Zone

**In dwelling units per acre (DUA)
**About the Framework Plan**

The Framework Plan is an aspirational vision for the long-term redevelopment of the study area using general land use categories in approximate locations. It combines transportation and land use to show how each can reinforce one another to create balanced growth.

As with any aspirational plan, the Framework Plan is not a mandate for redevelopment. Existing uses that are inconsistent with the plan are likely to remain for many years as the plan is incrementally realized. All redevelopment assumes willing land sellers and developers.

---

**Legend**
- **Proposed Streetscape**
- **Light Rail w/Stop**
- **Bicycle Facility**
  - **On-Street**
  - **Multi-use Trail**
- **Streets**
  - **Existing**
  - **New Publicly-Built**
  - **New Privately-Built**
- **Proposed Land Use**
  - **Single-Family**
  - **Highway Commercial**
  - **Office/Commercial**
  - **Technology Park**
  - **General Mixed-Use**
  - **High-Rise Mixed-Use**
- **Alignments subject to modification during future engineering/design.**
- **Locations are illustrative only.**

---

**Figure 4.2: Framework Plan**
under-use of land adjacent to a MARTA station. Because future transit expansions in the region are likely to be limited, at best, existing transit access makes this area too important to remain as low density uses that fail to capitalize on transit access.

Please see GM Site Recommendations on pages 86 through 92 for more recommendations and a vision for how this might look.

**Encourage transit-oriented development within walking distance of the MARTA station, especially convenience shops, residences, offices, and civic uses.**

Truly transit-oriented development is central to the vision of this plan. This includes creating compact, walkable, and mixed land uses whose design, programming, and parking take advantage of MARTA access. Generally, these should be concentrated within one-half mile of the station.

**Make New Peachtree Road Doraville’s “Main Street” again with sidewalk-oriented retail uses on the first floor and residential or office uses above.**

At one time Doraville had a traditional downtown along New Peachtree Road. Unfortunately, MARTA station construction replaced it with parking. Consistent with the above policy, planned streetscape upgrades and redevelopment are an opportunity to re-establish a “Main Street” character in this area.

**Reinforce the connection between New Peachtree and Buford Highway by promoting sidewalk-oriented uses along Park and Central Avenues.**

A need exists to extend the Doraville Town Center experience to Buford Highway to create an appealing link to the Northwoods neighborhood and establish a highly-visible presence on Buford Highway. Park and Central Avenues are ideal places to do this, and over time should be activated with sidewalk-oriented commercial, civic, or residential uses. In some cases this may required creative design solutions given topography, but it is still possible.

**Promote offices along Buford Highway near I-285.**

In addition to proposed offices northwest of the MARTA line, an opportunity also exists to develop them near I-285 at Buford Highway. Offices here could capitalize on highway visibility, create jobs, and buffer areas to the south from I-285 noise.

**Provide appropriate transitions between new development and existing neighborhoods.**

A variety of design techniques exist for mitigating the impacts of redevelopment on adjacent houses in Northwoods. These could include conventional techniques such as buffers, or innovative site planning that uses small lot single-family houses or townhouses to make the transition.

Please see the following page potential approaches.
In addition to conventional buffers, several techniques exist for providing transitions between new development and single-family houses. The following are options that should be explored individually or combined, especially as redevelopment occurs adjacent to the Northwoods neighborhood.

**Potential Neighborhood Transitions**

**Alley**

**Height Transitions**

**Transitional Use**

(often townhouses or small lot single-family houses)
GM Site Redevelopment Recommendations

The GM site is once-in-a-generation opportunity to transform the greater Doraville area. Despite today’s economic conditions, the site is too strategic to develop at anything less than its full potential. Rather, redevelopment should only occur when it creates a model transit-oriented development providing high paying jobs, housing, retail, and open space in a pedestrian-friendly setting.

GM Redevelopment Policies

Establish a development program that will achieve the community’s vision.

The redevelopment of the former GM plant is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform the greater Doraville area. Because the site is well served by transit and highways, and because it is away from single-family neighborhood, its redevelopment should maximize the amount of employment, retail, and residential uses in order to generate transit ridership and grow the tax base. To that end, the program shown in Table 4.2 reflects the range of development that would be appropriate on the site long-term, with the lower figure reflecting the minimum needed to achieve the LCI vision, and the higher reflecting the carrying capacity of the site. A realistic, financially viable program will probably fall somewhere between the two and may include additional uses, such as hotels.

Maximize internal and external connectivity for all transportation modes, primarily through the creation of new tree-lined streets, sidewalks, and multi-use paths.

The transportation network on the following page is most important element of the site’s vision. Interconnected streets and multi-use paths are laid out to support many different redevelopment programs, ranging from the low density scenario in Redevelopment Concept A to the high density one in Redevelopment Concept B.

Provide the greatest pedestrian orientation at MARTA.

The portion of the site within one-half mile of the MARTA station should be the most pedestrian-oriented. This is the zone in which most people are likely to walk from the station to access uses in the proposed redevelopment.

Table 4.2: Recommended GM Site Development Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office/R&amp;D/High-Tech¹</td>
<td>1 million sf</td>
<td>7 million sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000 jobs</td>
<td>21,000 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Restaurant</td>
<td>150,000 sf</td>
<td>1 million sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 jobs</td>
<td>2,000 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential²</td>
<td>1,000 units</td>
<td>5,000 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Plazas</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>40 acres⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block sizes (near MARTA)³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000 ft perimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block sizes (other areas)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000 ft perimeter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total square feet provided is less important than achieving the number of white collar jobs identified.
2. Includes condominiums, townhomes, senior housing, and high quality rentals.
3. Within one-quarter mile of the proposed station entrance.
4. Because parks do not generate transit ridership, the site is too precious to be dedicated to more than 40 acres of them unless the minimum development program is accommodated on the remaining land.
Figure 4.3: GM Site Block Plan

Legend
- Light Rail w/Stop
- Mandatory Storefront

Prepared for: City of Doraville

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.

Figure 4.3: GM Site Block Plan
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Redevelopment Concept A

The proposed block plan can accommodate many different uses that cannot be defined today given the long-term nature of buildout.

Redevelopment Concept A shows how the site could be transformed in a relatively low density scenario of primarily low-rise, surface parked buildings, with a small concentration of mid-rise buildings adjacent to the MARTA station. Such could accommodate the following program:

- 0.5 - 1.0 million sf of Class A office
- 0.5 - 1.0 million sf of retail space
- 150,000 - 200,000 sf of retail
- 1,000 - 2,000 housing units
- 14 acres of park space

Of these uses, big box retail could front I-285 near the existing BrandsMart, with mixed-uses and offices closest to MARTA. Housing could occur to the west, where proposed parks would create a quality residential address.

The plan also shows how some streets could be removed to accommodate a sports complex. Such complex could include a recreational center, sports medicine offices, ball fields, and other low intensity facilities. It should not include a major sports stadium.
About the Illustrative Plan
This plan shows one option for the configuration of buildings, including:
- 0.5 - 1.0 million sf Class A Office
- 0.5 - 1.0 million sf Research Space
- 150,000 - 200,000 sf Retail
- 1,000 - 2,000 Housing Units
- 14 acres Park Space

This graphic is for illustrative purposes only. It is intended to show one possible option for long-term redevelopment of the former GM site. This assumes that any redevelopment will only occur when willing landowners sell sites to willing developers. Furthermore, all building locations and footprints are the artist's interpretations.
**Redevelopment Concept B**

This concept shows how the proposed block plan could accommodate nearly four times the development program of Redevelopment Concept A by incorporating taller buildings and structured parking, while still abiding by FAA height limits. This would maximize existing and future transit use, generate thousands of jobs, and create a truly regional activity center.

Redevelopment Concept B envisions:
- 4.0 - 5.0 million sf of Class A office
- 1.5 - 2.0 million sf of research space
- 500,000 - 800,000 sf retail
- 3,000 - 4,000 housing units
- 16 acres of park space

Their distribution is similar to Redevelopment Concept A, with an intense mixed-use core with ground floor shops running northwest from the MARTA station, big box retail or hotels along I-285, and a mix of offices, housing, and hotels on the remainder of the site.

Also notable within this concept is that structured parking decks could provide opportunities for rooftop gardens or green roofs. This could reduce urban heating, reduce stormwater runoff, and provide amenities for future residents and workers.

*Figure 4.6: Concept Plan B*
About the Illustrative Plan
This plan shows one option for the configuration of buildings, including:
- 4.0 - 5.0 million sf Class A Office
- 1.5 - 2.0 million sf Research Space
- 500,000 - 800,000 sf Retail
- 3,000 - 4,000 Housing Units
- 16 acres Park Space

This graphic is for illustrative purposes only. It is intended to show one possible option for long-term redevelopment of the former GM site. This assumes that any redevelopment will only occur when willing landowners sell sites to willing developers. Furthermore, all building locations and footprints are the artist’s interpretations.
Create a quality public realm that incorporates water and open space throughout.

The incorporation of water and open space into the redevelopment is critical to establish a distinctive, high-quality identity that differentiates it from other sites in the region and attract major employers. The vision provides these amenities by establishing a spine of three major green spaces, each with their own character. These include:

- **The Square**, a 0.8 acre formal space near the MARTA station ringed by shops and featuring hardscapes, formally planted trees, cafes, and sculptural fountains.
- **The Green**, a less formal 3.5 acre space with large lawns and potential outdoor performance space.
- **Bubbling Creek Park**, an informal 6.6 acre space surrounding the Bubbling Creek spring and featuring a pond.

Connecting these spaces, a series of reflecting pools and streams is envisioned to aerate water, create a unique design feature, and symbolically express the use of water in a variety of settings ranging from urban, closest to MARTA, to a more natural condition at Bubbling Creek Park.

**Promote environmentally sustainability redevelopment.**

The redevelopment of the GM site should incorporate green building and site planning techniques to create a model for how redevelopment of a former industrial site can actually improve environmental health. Techniques may include:

- Removing existing contaminants on the site.
- Incorporating “green” buildings, roof top gardens, and similar techniques.
- Using sustainable stormwater management such as porous paving or bio-retention to minimize downstream erosion and pollution; these should be incorporate into proposed parks.
- Restoring Bubbling Creek to its natural state.
- Maximizing the use of alternatives transportation, especially walking and bicycling, by incorporating existing bus service, taxi-stands, reduced parking ratios, car sharing, bike racks, and similar features.

**Incorporate public facilities into redevelopment.**

Depending on the scale of redevelopment, fire stations, schools, and similar facilities may also be necessary to serve the site. If so, such should be included in the program.

**Integrate I-285 transit into the site.**

Once transit arrives at the site, at-grade transit integrated into the new street network is preferred; if this cannot occur the transit should run along I-285 to avoid negative site impacts.
Increase housing options, including high-end and affordable units in mixed income communities.

A variety of housing types should be provided for persons of different ages, incomes, and lifestyles. However, rather than single-use zones separated by unit type or price, this mix should be carefully integrated into well-designed communities.

Encourage redevelopment of apartment sites into mixed-income multifamily housing.

The study area today lacks high-quality multifamily housing. Its existing apartments represent ideal sites to redevelop into higher density, mixed-income, and mixed-use housing, especially given their access to MARTA rail and existing retail services. However, such redevelopment should only occur if the proposed projects are consistent with this plan; low-quality, auto-oriented apartments are not acceptable.

Coordinate with Chamblee and DeKalb County on land use planning and redevelopment issues.

Although the study area lies within the Doraville and Chamblee, coordination between these two communities and DeKalb County on land use and redevelopment will be necessary to maximize the benefits of growth and minimize potential negative impacts.

Land Use Projects

GM site and town center zoning (O-1)

For the plan’s vision to become reality, zoning must established that supports it. New form-based zoning should be implemented that is flexible enough to allow developments to adapt to changing market conditions, while still ensuring basic tenets of sound planning. Elements may include:

- Permitting a mix of uses
- Defining urban design standards, such as buildings fronting the street, and side or rear parking
- Establishing sidewalk standards
- Defining architectural and material standards
- Requiring usable open space, rather than unusable buffers
- Providing quality mixed-income housing incentives
- Reducing parking requirement close to MARTA station

Buford Highway zoning (O-2)

Proactive, flexible zoning must also be created along Buford Highway, but it should be crafted in such a way that recognizes its inherent long-term auto orientation. To this end, some items customarily included in LCI community zoning, such as a complete prohibition of frontal, may not be appropriate there.

GM site rezoning (O-3)

Please see Section 5.2 Zoning and Land Use Changes for details.

Expanded residential code enforcement (O-4)

Code enforcement should be expanded in neighborhoods and multifamily complexes

GM site redevelopment (O-5)

Please see GM Site Redevelopment Concepts for details.

Doraville Town Center redevelopment (O-6)

Please see Doraville Town Center Concept for details.

MARTA property request for proposals (O-6)

As part of the Doraville Town Center vision, part of MARTA’s parking lot will have to be redeveloped. For this to happen, it will be necessary for MARTA to issue a request for proposals for said redevelopment.
**Doraville Town Center Concept**

The vision for the town center area calls for restoring and expanding the walkable, pedestrian-oriented core that once existed in Doraville. Central to this is introducing new streets, parks, and uses. In total these represent:

- 500,000 - 1 million sf of Class A office
- 150,000 - 250,000 sf of retail
- 40,000 - 120,000 sf of government/civic
- 800 - 1,300 Housing units
- 2 acres of park space

At the heart of this vision lies the proposed Town Square, a one-acre park at the site of the current police station and ringed with office, commercial, or residential uses. To its northeast, on the site of the current city hall, the plan envisions a new municipal complex or private development.

In keeping with a desire to promote economic growth, the plan also capitalizes on visibility from I-285 by placing mid-rise office buildings along Stewart Road, where they provide a major employment opportunity. Smaller community-serving offices and retail uses could be scattered throughout the area as well, especially along New Peachtree Road and Park Avenue.

This image shows how the proposed Town Square and surrounding buildings might look.
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Figure 4.8: Doraville Town Center Illustrative Plan

This graphic is for illustrative purposes only. It is intended to show one possible option for long-term redevelopment of the heart of Doraville. This assumes that any redevelopment will only occur when willing landowners sell sites to willing developers. Furthermore, all building locations and footprints are the artist’s interpretations.

About the Illustrative Plan
This plan shows one option for the configuration of buildings, including:
- 500,000 - 1 million sf Class A Office
- 150,000 - 250,000 sf Retail
- 40,000 - 120,000 sf Government/Civic
- 800 - 1,300 Housing Units
- 2 acres Park Space


Prepared for: City of Doraville

This map produced using data provided by the Atlanta Regional Commission, field work by Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and other public sources. Data are not guaranteed.
Environmental Policies

Locate new housing, schools, and parks where they will not be negatively impacted by air pollution from I-285.
The Framework Plan envisions placing such facilities away or downwind of the highway to minimize potential impacts on users.

*Promote protection of natural waterways, such as the Nancy Creek and Peachtree Creek spring heads.*
Several springs and creeks exist in the study area. These should be protected and restored as the area redevelopments. In other communities, such features have become amenities.

*Install labels on storm drains to make people aware of impacts on streams.*
Help make people think twice before pouring chemicals in drains.

*Incorporate sustainable development practices.*
New public and private buildings should strive to meet an established standard for sustainability, such as LEED (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design).

*Reduce the environmental impacts of parking.*
Parking consumes a large amount of land, contributes to heating in summer, and increases water runoff. Structured parking decks can free up land for other uses, including open space, while pervious paving can accelerate water infiltration.

*Encourage the use of permeable paving.*
Permeable paving is appropriate for parking and hardscape pedestrian surfaces, where it allows water to percolate into the soil rather than contributing to runoff and flooding. It can take the form of pervious materials or open grid pavers.

*Embrace sustainable stormwater management techniques.*
Many techniques exist for managing stormwater in a less damaging way. These include use of pervious paving, bio-swales, and rooftop gardens, to name a few. These and other techniques should be embraced in the greater Doraville community.

*Encourage use of renewable energy.*
Renewal energy helps increase energy independence and reduces environmental impacts.

*Minimize exterior light pollution.*
Reducing light pollution saves energy, preserves views of the night sky, and benefits wildlife.
Support local food production.
Even if they produce only a small portion of a household’s food, community gardens and related programs make a difference long-term by changing society’s thoughts about food production.

Encourage green roofs.
Green roofs reduce urban heating and stormwater runoff. They are highly encouraged in new development.

Encourage tree planting on private property, in both existing and new development.
Property owners are encouraged to plant trees to ensure the long-term preservation of the tree canopy.

Encourage xeriscaping and native species in all landscape design projects.
Xeriscaping, where plant materials are native to the region and use available water, should be promoted in public and private projects.

Encourage the use of plants that are native or adaptive to the Georgia Piedmont.
Such plants require less water to irrigate than other species, provide food for native birds and insects, and are more tolerant to local temperature extremes.

Environmental Projects

Buford Highway corridor and parking lot bio-retention (O-8)
Bio-retention could be implemented along Buford Highway and within adjacent parking lots to promote sustainable stormwater management and improve water quality. Existing parking lots, in particular, are a major environmental liability and could be retrofitted with ponds or infiltration areas.

Cleaning and restoration of Bubbling Creek and its banks as part of establishing a greenway (O-9)
Today the banks of Bubbling Creek are eroded and overgrown with invasive species in some locations. They must be restored before creation of a linear park or walking path along it.

Per Federal law, clean-up of any contamination that might exist on the GM site prior to its redevelopment (O-10)
Prior to redevelopment, Federal law requires that any contaminants found on the former GM site be remediated to make it usable for the mix of housing, offices, retail, and open space uses envisioned by this plan. If clean-up is required, any contaminants found must be disposed of outside of the City of Doraville.
4.3 Transportation

As the study area redevelops it should provide a range of transportation options. In addition to driving, the area should encourage bicycling, walking, and transit use. Smooth and speedy traffic flow should be provided along major arterials and collectors, but local streets should be focused on responding to adjacent land uses and development patterns, rather simply moving as many vehicles as possible in the shortest amount of time.

General Transportation Policies

Create a balanced transportation system that does not promote one form of travel at the expense of another.

Although transit service and sidewalks exist in the study area today, it is overwhelmingly auto-oriented. However, as the area grows, it must do so in a way that expands non-vehicular facilities and ensures that travel types are balanced with the land use vision.

Use a complete street approach for new or redesigned streets.

A “complete street” is designed to consider the array of potential travel modes and how each mode would use the street, with a balance struck between motorized and non-motorized users.

Create new streets and inter-parcel connections.

As the area grows new interconnected streets must be created to provide more routes for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. In addition, where new streets are not feasible, connections between adjacent properties should be provided so people can drive, walk, or bicycle between them without going onto the adjacent road.

Require streets in new developments to connect.

Where developments abut land likely to redevelop in the next 25 years, street stubs should be built to the property line so that those streets can one day be extended onto said property. Where a new development adjoins an existing stub, it should connect to it.

Minimize dead-end streets.

Other than stub streets designed to one day connect to adjacent sites, cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets should be minimized to provide pedestrian connectivity and support multimodal travel.

Support connecting nearby neighborhoods to the study area.

For the study area to truly be the heart of Doraville, it should be accessible from nearby neighborhoods. Ideas to better connect the study area to nearby neighborhoods with improved bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and roadway facilities should continue to be explored as the community grows.
Support access management along Buford Highway.
Access management ensures a smooth traffic flow, reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflict, and reduces conflicts between on-street bicyclists and drivers. Access management can include shared driveways, inter-parcel access, alleys, or side street access.

Require a transportation management plan for the GM site.
When a developer is selected for the GM site an effort must be made to ensure that its redevelopment maximizes the use of transit, walking, bicycling, and carpooling. This will reduce land dedicated to parking, encourage transit use and promote physical activity. A transportation management plan (TMP) is an ideal tool for this.

Vehicular Transportation Policies

Promote shared parking arrangements wherever possible to decrease the number of underused parking spaces.
Different land uses have parking needs at different times of the day and week. Allowing shared parking can make more efficient use of land and keep parking from sitting empty.

Promote on-street parking, except on state highways.
On-street parking is important to support retailers and create a safe pedestrian environment. It should be maximized on existing streets where possible, and incorporated into most new streets.

Vehicular Transportation Projects

Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector (T-9)
This project completes a regional link from Buford Highway (SR 13) to Peachtree Boulevard (SR 141). It begins at the Shallowford Road/Buford Highway intersection, then follows Shallowford Road and a new roadway to Peachtree Road. From here it follows Peachtree

The proposed Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector should have four travel lanes, plus an off-street cycle track, sidewalks, street trees, and pedestrian lighting on both sides.
Figure 4.9: Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector Option A
Figure 4.10: Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector Option B
Railroad Crossing Option Assessment

During the planning process a variety of options for roadways crossings of the freight and MARTA railroad were explored prior to selecting the proposed Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector. The following is a summary of these options. Please note that all of these assume no change to existing MARTA facilities due to an estimated $100 to $150 million price tag.

**Option 1: Reroute Shallowford Road**

This option would route Shallowford Road in a northwesterly direction just before the existing intersection with New Peachtree Road, then use a proposed bridge to cross the existing rail lines, and finally terminate in the GM re-development site. This proposed route would require minimal right-of-way acquisition and satisfy the need for regional traffic movement across the rail lines. However it would require future road upgrades to Shallowford Road and the reconfiguration of the New Peachtree Road/Shallowford Road intersection. Ultimately this option was not selected due to the termination point of the new road within the GM re-development site. Redevelopment options would be reduced for the site if a new roadway entered at this location.

**Option 2: New Road from Buford Highway**

This option would construct a new road from Buford Highway, across from the existing Pinetree Plaza entrance, to an area just south of the New Peachtree Road/Shallowford Road intersection. Option 2 includes a proposed bridge to cross the existing rail lines, and terminates in the GM re-development site. This route would directly connect existing major roads and utilize an existing signal along Buford Highway. However, it would displace several businesses and apartments, leading to a high right-of-way cost. Also the existing New Peachtree Road/Shallowford Road intersection would need to be reconfigured to accommodate this new road. In the end this option was not selected for the same reason as Option 1, that the termination point of the new road would be within the GM redevelopment site and would reduce the development potential.

**Option 3: New Road from Buford Highway (Oakmont Ave.)**

This option would construct a new road from Buford Highway, across from the existing intersection with Oakmont Avenue, and proceed in a northwesterly direction. The route would cross the existing rail lines with a bridge terminating in the middle of the GM redevelopment site. This route would have frontage near the existing Flowers Park and ultimately have low right-of-way impact. The route would also align with an existing intersection and directly connect neighborhoods. The negative impacts of this option are the termination point of the new road within the GM redevelopment site, and signal upgrades to Buford Highway. This option was not selected due to the negative impacts it would have on the GM redevelopment site.
**Option 4: Tunnel Connection from Park Avenue**

This option would construct a new tunnel from Park Avenue in a northwesterly direction terminating in the middle of the GM redevelopment site. This route would have the smallest footprint of any studied, and would require the least amount of right-of-way acquisition. However, this route would add a significant amount of traffic to Park Avenue, posing the need for future roadway upgrades to Park Avenue. It would also displace an existing MARTA parking lot. In addition, although this option is positioned in the best place topographically, the feasibility of a tunnel from a local street is low. Ultimately this option was not selected due to cost, the termination point of the tunnel within the GM redevelopment site, and the significant improvements that would need to be made to Park Avenue.

**Option 5: Bridge from Shallowford Road to Peachtree Road (Preferred Route)**

This option would construct a new road from Shallowford Road in a northwesterly direction connecting to Peachtree Road, crossing the existing rail lines with a proposed bridge. This route of the new road would follow along a property line between an existing apartment complex and a commercial property. The proposed bridge would span over the New Peachtree Road and the existing rail lines and terminate at a vacant lot near Peachtree Road. The proposed route would serve as a regional connection between two state routes (Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard) via Shallowford Road and Peachtree Road. The significant advantage of this option is that it remains entirely outside the footprint of the GM redevelopment site. Negatively, the increased traffic to Shallowford Road and Peachtree Road would require roadway upgrades. Also any impacts on the properties adjacent to the bridge would need to be evaluated and could result in additional right-of-way acquisition. This option was chosen as the preferred option for the design of a regional connection across the existing rail lines due to the low number of negative impacts, minimal restriction to the footprint of the GM redevelopment site, and because it connects two state routes.

**Option 6: Tunnel from Shallowford Road to Peachtree Road**

This option would construct a new road from Buford Highway to the intersection of New Peachtree Road and Shallowford Road, where a new traffic circle would replace the existing signalized intersection. A new road would be constructed from the traffic circle towards the rail lines that would use an S-curve to align parallel to the tracks and drop in elevation and cross the rail lines with a new tunnel. The tunnel would terminate on the northwestern side of the rail lines in a vacant lot and connect to Peachtree Road. The proposed route would serve as a regional connection between two state routes (Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard) via Shallowford Road and Peachtree Road.

Similar to Option 5, the significant advantage of this option is that it remains entirely outside the footprint of the GM redevelopment site. However this route would necessitate excessive right-of-way cost and excessive construction cost. This option was not the lead crossing option, but has been selected as an alternative if funding is available. The deciding factors in the selection of this option as an alternate are the direct connection of two state routes and the minimal impact to the GM redevelopment site.
Road to a new roadway connecting to Clyde Drive, then follows Clyde Drive to North Peachtree Road, ending at the North Peachtree Road/Peachtree Boulevard intersection. The project includes intersection upgrades to Shallowford Road at Buford Highway and North Peachtree Road at Peachtree Boulevard, and roadway upgrades to Shallowford Road, Peachtree Road, Clyde Drive and North Peachtree Road. It also includes a bridge over the existing New Peachtree Road/rail corridor, and connecting existing roads to the new connector. The proposed typical section includes four travel lanes, two cycle tracks, sidewalks, street trees, lighting and other pedestrian facilities.

**Street realignments (T-10)**
These projects would improve traffic flow at misaligned streets and provide intersection signalization.

- Realignment of Chestnut Drive with Park Avenue. (T-10a) This would create a centralized route for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorist from the Northwoods neighborhood to the MARTA station. It would require the acquisition of one business.
- Realignment of Clearview Avenue with Jess Norman Way. (T-10b) This project would eliminate an unsignalized intersection near the I-285 eastbound ramp, relieving congestion at the intersection. This will also make other proposed projects (free flow right turn ramp) more feasible.

**Central Avenue right turn only (T-11)**
The conversion of the Central Avenue/Buford Highway unsignalized intersection into right-turn-only would reduce congestion and improve safety by restricting vehicles from crossing southbound Buford Highway traffic. The project would be most effective when combined with the realignment of Chestnut Avenue with Park Avenue, giving motorist a signalized alternative to the left turn at Central Avenue.

**Buford Highway free flow ramp to I-285 eastbound (T-12)**
This project would add an isolated on-ramp from Buford Highway into I-285 to reduce traffic storage problems on Buford Highway during peak hours. The existing on-ramp would need to be widened to incorporate this; it could be combined with the realignment of Clearview Avenue and the addition of another eastbound through lane from Motor Industrial Way.

**Two through lanes on Motor Industrial Way (T-13)**
This project would widen and restripe the existing eastbound on-ramp and alter the signalization of the Motor Industrial Way/Buford Highway intersection to provide two through lanes onto I-285 eastbound. This will reduce the traffic storage on Motor Industrial Way in peak hours.

**I-285 exit ramp extension to Creston Drive (T-14)**
This project would allow traffic exiting I-285 from the east to continue directly to New Peachtree Road rather than using Buford Highway and Longmire Way as a cut-through. This access will be especially functional for the large volume of fuel tanker trucks using the existing route to get to their destination. Traffic on Central and Park Avenues would also be reduced by this direct route to the MARTA station.

**Traffic circle at New Peachtree Road and Shallowford Road (T-15)**
This project proposes a traffic circle to improve an existing problematic intersection of New Peachtree and Shallowford Roads. A traffic circle would realign the current skew and create a connection to another proposed road from Pinetree Plaza. The traffic circle would include landscaping and pedestrian facilities for a non-vehicular route thru the proposed intersection.

**New Publicly funded streets (T-16)**
As the area grows, new public streets must be added to eliminate “super blocks” and create alternate routes to reduce congestion. These should be designed to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, landscaping, and other features specified in the city standards. Locations include:
• Oakmont Avenue west from Buford Highway to New Peachtree Road. (T-16a) This project would create a centralized route for pedestrians and motorists from Oakmont Avenue to the MARTA station without having to use Park Avenue via a left turn on Buford Highway. It would require the acquisition of two parcels.

• Realignment of the Pinetree Plaza entrance and a new street to the proposed traffic circle. (T-16b) This project would assist in spacing the existing traffic signals along Buford Highway and provide a direct access to New Peachtree Road. It would require the acquisition of three parcels.

• Extend Terrell Drive to Peachtree Road. (T-16c) This project would eliminate an existing cul-de-sac and improve police and fire department response times because of fewer dead-ends. This project would require only one right-of-way acquisition.

• Extend John Glenn Drive to Peachtree Road. (T-16d) This project would eliminate an existing cul-de-sac and improve police and fire department response times because of fewer dead-ends. This project would require only one right-of-way acquisition.

• New street from Shallowford Road to Central Avenue. (T-16e) This project would provide a mid-block route for pedestrians and vehicles to change cross streets between New Peachtree Road and Buford Highway. It would also allow businesses along Buford Highway to have a rear entrance, possibly reducing the number of existing driveways along Buford Highway. The street would require acquisition of several business and apartments.

• New street from Flowers Road to redeveloped GM site. (T-16f) This project would provide vehicular access from north of I-285 to the GM site without using Peachtree Boulevard. It could be joined with the proposed Railside Path designed share an adjoining bridge. Right-of-way acquisition would be minimal since the majority of the project area lies within existing right-of-way.

**Wayfinding signage (T-17)**

This project would assist pedestrians and vehicular traffic with directions and locations of prominent City of Doraville facilities. It should not require right-of-way acquisition.

**Georgia Navigator signage (T-18)**

This project would add Georgia Navigator traffic status signs on Buford Highway to alert approaching vehicles of the current status of east and westbound I-285. On-ramp congestion would then be limited by alerted vehicles using alternate routes. This project should not require any right-of-way acquisition.

**Stewart Road to I-285 ramp access (T-19)**

This project would provide vehicles traveling on Stewart Road from Northwoods with direct access to the eastbound I-285 on-ramp, thus eliminating the need to enter Buford Highway. It would depend upon the realignment of Clearview Avenue with Jess Norman Way.
New privately funded streets with redevelopment (T-20)
A large portion of the study area is comprised of the former GM site; therefore a majority of the area will be redeveloped by private entities. In order to avoid congestion, a well accessible street network should be designed to allow traffic flow within the site, as well as to and from the site. A general road network is proposed in this report that meets both of these qualifications.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Policies
The focus for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is to provide safe, accessible, and connected facilities. Primary considerations for pedestrian and bicyclist safety are traffic volumes, design and separation, and traffic speed. Lowering speeds on pedestrian-oriented streets is especially critical; as noted in the Federal Highway Administration Pedestrian Facilities User Guide, “Speeding has serious consequences when a pedestrian is involved. A pedestrian hit at 40 mph has an 85 percent chance of being killed; at 30 mph, the likelihood goes down to 45 percent, while at 20 mph, the fatality rate is only 5 percent. Faster speeds increase the likelihood of a pedestrian being hit. At higher speeds, motorists are less likely to see a pedestrian, and are even less likely to be able to stop in time to avoid hitting one.” As a result, the recommendations here focus on improving walking and bicycling in areas most suitable to them.

On existing streets, require new developments to install or upgrade adjacent sidewalks.
Recommended standards for new sidewalks are as follows:

- Buford Highway and Peachtree Boulevard: Minimum 5 foot landscape zone with breakaway trees; minimum 6 foot sidewalk
- New Peachtree Road: 8 foot landscape/parking zone with canopy trees; 6 foot bike track; 2.5 foot buffer; 6 foot sidewalk
- Other streets: Minimum 5 foot landscape zone with canopy trees; minimum 6 foot sidewalk

Due to limited right-of-way, it is likely that portions of these sidewalks will fall on private property.

Provide quality sidewalks on new streets.
These should include a minimum 5 foot landscape zone with canopy trees and minimum 6 foot sidewalk. Where retail uses occur adjacent to the sidewalk, wider widths are encouraged.

Adjacent to commercial uses wider sidewalks are encouraged for dining or display.
The provision of sidewalks alone is not enough to create a place where people want to walk. Use of areas adjacent to the sidewalk for commercial displays or cafe dining can activate the sidewalk and make walking more enjoyable and safe.
**Design new buildings to support walking with basic urban design elements.**

In addition to outdoor displays and dining, the design of buildings can greatly impact the walkability of an area. Where walking is desired, buildings should front the street with doors, windows, stoops, interesting architecture, and active uses.

**Provide public facilities and buildings that are accessible and visitable to persons with disabilities and the elderly.**

All new public facilities, including parks, sidewalks, and buildings should be accessible to persons with disabilities and the elderly.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects**

A number of specific sidewalk and trail recommendations have been identified to improve multimodal access, connectivity, and mobility. As noted in Part 2: Inventory and Analysis, the area currently lacks a consistent sidewalk or bicycle network. This plan supports expanding options for non-motorized transportation and providing a means for those living, working, or going to school in the area to access nearby employment, shopping, dining, and other destinations without driving.

**Pedestrian facilities (T-1)**

These projects will provide safer walking and support development, which, in turn, will encourage walking and transit use, improve public health, strengthen social bonds, and support businesses. Upgrades include curbs and gutters, sidewalks, pedestrian lighting, landscaping, street furniture, and other features.

- New Peachtree Road from Stewart Road to Flowers Park. (T-1a) Improvements include a cycle track and sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, pedestrian crossing signals and four traffic signals at Park Avenue, Central Avenue, the MARTA parking deck, and Stewart Road. The project has already been pre-qualified by the ARC, and requires minimal right-of-way.
- Park Avenue from New Peachtree Road to Buford Highway. (T-1b) Improvements include sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, pedestrian crossing signals and a traffic signal at Buford Highway. The project has already been pre-qualified by the ARC, and requires minimal right-of-way.
- Shallowford Road from Buford Highway to New Peachtree Road. (T-1c). Improvements include a cycle track and sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, pedestrian crossing signals and a traffic signal at New Peachtree Road.
- Peachtree Road from Peachtree Boulevard to Proposed Connector. (T-1d) Improvements include a cycle track and sidewalks, landscaping, and pedestrian lighting.

The space between buildings and the street could be used for outdoor dining in walkable areas

Buildings should provide ground floor doors and windows facing the sidewalks

Facilities must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (photo courtesy Michael Ronkin)
• Buford Highway from Park Avenue to I-285. (T-1e) Improvements include sidewalk renovation and bicycle facilities to match the adjacent completed TE project.
• Church Street from Central Avenue to Stewart Road. (T-1f) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and sharrow markings.
• King Avenue from New Peachtree Road to Church Street. (T-1g) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and sharrow markings.
• Jess Norman Way from Buford Highway to Stewart Road. (T-1h) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, lighting, pedestrian crossing signals, and a traffic signal on Buford Highway.
• Stewart Road from Jess Norman Way to Stewart Court. (T-1i) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, and pedestrian lighting.
• Chestnut Drive from Buford Highway to Pineland Avenue. (T-1j) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle lanes/path connecting to North Fork Peachtree Creek.
• North Peachtree Road from Peachtree Boulevard to Peachtree Road. (T-1k) Improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and sharrow markings.

Proposed pedestrian facilities on New Peachtree Road would narrow the roadway to provide space for off-street, one-way cycle tracks and wider sidewalks. The section could also accommodate future on-street parking within the proposed landscape zone; this will be essential to vibrant retail.
Standards for street furniture, trees, and lighting (T-2)
This project would develop citywide standards for street sections and layouts, street trees, and street furniture. A common design would improve the community image and promote local identity. Please see Part 5: Implementation for suggested standards.

Peachtree Boulevard sidewalk improvements (T-3)
This proposed project would fill missing sections of sidewalk along both sides of Peachtree Boulevard. This would create a continuous route for pedestrians from I-285 down to North Peachtree Road.

Walking path along Bubbling Creek (T-4)
This path would provide a pedestrian and bicycle link along Bubbling Creek from the GM site to points west. In doing so, it would encourage access from Chamblee’s neighborhoods and downtown to the study area.

Pedestrian improvements on Park Avenue would install sidewalks on the east side, where they are currently missing, as well as install trees and lighting on both sides of the streets; sharrow markings for bicyclists are also proposed.
Proposed improvements to the intersection of New Peachtree Road and Park Avenue will greatly improve safety for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, while supporting the vision for reestablishing a vibrant mixed-use core for Doraville.
Proposed improvements to Park Avenue will create a consistent, high quality environment for pedestrians to walk from the MARTA station to Buford Highway businesses, the Northwoods neighborhood, and Doraville city offices.
Pedestrian access to Pinetree Plaza (T-5)
This project would provide residents of the Northwoods neighborhood and surrounding areas with a more direct access to Pinetree Plaza and the Buford Highway corridor. Currently they must walk an extended route around the shopping center to Oakmont Avenue or McClave Drive, which does not encourage walking travel.

Pedestrian Bridge over MARTA (T-6)
This project would provide pedestrian access from the town center to the GM site. Currently only one pedestrian route exists in the area, along Motor Industrial Way. This route would link downtown Doraville and the MARTA station to the redeveloped area and make the latter feel like it is part of the greater Doraville community.

The bridge should also incorporate direct access between the MARTA station and a proposed rail station to the northwest.

Railside multi-use path over I-285 (T-7)
This project will provide pedestrian and bicycle access from north of I-285, outside of the study area, to the GM redevelopment, and eventually to Peachtree Road and downtown Chamblee. Currently this trip can only be made along New Peachtree Road.

Bicycle racks at city-owned properties (T-8)
This project will add bicycle racks at city-owned facilities to encourage bicycle use.

Transit Policies

Promote transit ridership with increased density, walkability, and connectivity.

For transit to be effective development patterns must support it. The Framework Plan, GM Site Redevelopment Concepts, and Doraville Town Center Concepts do this by concentrating mixed-uses in a walkable, compact setting around existing and future transit.

Support rail transit along I-285 from the Perimeter business district to Doraville.

Rail transit along I-285 from Doraville to the Perimeter business district is essential to linking the two and spurring transit-supportive growth. Simply running buses in the corridor would fail to accomplish this because they have not been shown to change development patterns like rail can.
Support rail transit from I-285 north to Gwinnett County.
Rail transit into Doraville from Gwinnett County could further anchor the area's position as a highly desirable business address by improving non-motorized access to the community.

Locate any proposed new transit station west of the existing MARTA station on the GM site to avoid costly bridges and negatively impacting the town center area.
Transit along I-285 to Doraville and its MARTA station will establish the community as a key transfer site. However, such facilities should be located west of the existing MARTA station, on the former GM site. Not only will this maximize short-term opportunities to create transit-supportive development, but it will also minimize disruptions to the Town Center area.
On the GM site, transit should be at-grade and integrated into the development within or adjacent to its new streets. If this can't be accomplished and the alignment is elevated, it should run along I-285 to avoid limiting redevelopment. During the planning process, strong public sentiment was expressed for the former scenario. Please see GM Site Redevelopment Concepts for how this might be integrated into the site.

Oppose the use of the former GM site as a transit vehicle storage or maintenance yard.
The GM site should be developed in manner similar to that shown in the GM Site Redevelopment Concepts. It should not be used as a rail yard or maintenance facility.

Support creating a shuttle connecting Peachtree DeKalb Airport, International Village, Chamblee MARTA, Doraville MARTA and the Gwinnett Chinatown.
Said shuttle would improve connections between these existing business areas and expand transit options.

Support a local bus or van for residents that can’t walk.
Said service could pick residents up in their neighborhoods and bring them to the Doraville Town Center.

Support a commuter of intercity rail stop in the study area.
The proposed land use patterns and location make the study area well suited to a commuter or intercity rail stop. Such stop could use existing siding tracks adjacent to the GM site, and connect to MARTA via the proposed pedestrian bridge.

Provide seamless links between transit and other modes.
Transit stations should include bicycle parking or lockers, taxi-stands, car sharing, maps, and other amenities that make it easy to travel by means other than a car.
Transit Projects

Bus rapid transit on Buford Highway from the Lindbergh MARTA to Pleasant Hill Road (T-22)

Bus rapid transit (BRT) on Buford Highway would provide faster service for patrons traveling through the area. It would also reduce congestion, as fewer buses would make routine stops on the corridor. A study would evaluate if it is feasible.

Transit ITS on Buford Highway from Sidney Marcus to Pleasant Hill Road (T-23)

The addition of intelligent transportation (ITS) systems to the bus network on Buford Highway would provide faster service to patrons along the corridor. A study would evaluate if it is feasible.

MARTA on-train announcement updates to highlight positive attributes of Doraville (T-24)

A revised on-train announcement highlighting the positive attractions that Doraville has to offer would improve its image and encourage more visitors.

New MARTA parking deck (T-25)

Concurrent with redevelopment of the MARTA parking lots, a new deck may be needed to replace spaces that would be lost. An assessment would need to occur at such future time.

Rail transit from the Perimeter area to Doraville (T-26)

This project would provide rail transit along the I-285 corridor, linking the Perimeter business district to Doraville.

Rail transit into Gwinnett County (T-27)

This project would provide rail transit along I-85 into Gwinnett County, encouraging more access to Doraville.
4.4 Markets & Economics

In the coming decades, Downtown Master Plan LCI study area has the potential to develop into a high-quality business center similar to the Perimeter Center or Cumberland Mall areas. Like these places, it should feature a mix of quality retail, employment, and housing options. However, unlike these areas, which now face the daunting task of retrofitting their land use and transportation patterns to support walkable, mixed-use development trends, the redevelopment of the former GM site presents the opportunity to incorporate these features from the beginning into a master planned project and, in doing so, position the area for sustainable growth.

The policies and projects presented below are intended to enhance the business environment in the study area as well as Doraville as a whole. The recommendations build on stakeholder and public input, as well as market research that looked at retail, business, and residential opportunity in Doraville and its trade areas. Some recommendations presented here are specifically directed at the GM site, while others are intended for Doraville’s core and Buford Highway area.

Market & Economic Policies

*Establish a unique market image that complements, rather than competes with nearby business centers in Buckhead, Perimeter/Dunwoody, and Tucker.*

Doraville exists in a dynamic area and has significant competition from nearby business centers that are larger and more modern. Doraville must create its own identity with respect to these nearby centers. It must focus on its strengths and unique character, pursuing redevelopment that is distinctive within the larger market.

*Target industries to locate in the proposed GM redevelopment or technology village.*

Business recruitment efforts should target key large employers to locate in the redeveloped GM site, including:

- Corporate headquarters
- Medical, biotechnology, and life-science industries
- Data centers
- Green technologies

*Continue to promote a diversity of businesses, entrepreneurship, and ethnic investment, particularly along Buford Highway.*

Doraville has historically been a location for ethnic entrepreneurs and small businesses, resulting in unparalleled diversity of uses, people, and cultures. The community should not only celebrate and promote this diversity, but also ensure that the business environment continues to support this level of multicultural investment.
Promote “economic gardening” efforts to encourage growth of start-up businesses, while also attracting new businesses and investment.

Economic gardening tactics are often employed in communities that have lost major employers, or lack the resources to facilitate traditional economic development focusing solely on recruitment. Doraville should promote similar techniques that create an environment that cultivates homegrown entrepreneurs. The foundation of economic gardening is based on:

- Providing access to information, competitive intelligence and market research.
- Building an infrastructure for entrepreneur investment by enhancing quality of life.
- Creating connections between businesses, linking firms to interact and exchange information.

Economic gardening programs are more grass roots in nature, often focusing on specific targeted business types and their needs. The State of Georgia provides economic gardening resources, and a number of Georgia communities are creating programs. More information can be found at Georgia.org.

Recruit businesses that capitalize on transportation assets and Doraville’s international character.

With MARTA, two interstates, and PDK and ATL airports, Doraville is perhaps better connected than any other community to metro Atlanta and beyond. When coupled with the international identity of the community, Doraville has the ability to target businesses that have the need to reach a worldwide market, with a desire to locate in a community with global character.

Promote locally owned and operated businesses that cater to the local community, focusing on those needs identified in the market analysis.

Given the current economic climate as well as the tremendous amount of regional retail offerings, the market research shows limited opportunity for new retail in the short term. Therefore, business recruitment and support efforts should be twofold:

- In the short term, focus on the local base by marketing existing businesses to local customers, while also recruiting those businesses that are identified as needed in the market research (health and personal care stores, pharmacy, hardware, appliances). Support existing businesses while creating local loyalty through marketing.
- In the mid to long-term, as development opportunities arise per this plan, focus on the recruitment of unique destination based businesses that will draw from the greater metro region, yet are not located within nearby competitive markets.

Make surplus government land available for redevelopment.

Doraville has underutilized publicly owned land in key locations throughout the study area, some of which has redevelopment potential. It should promote any surplus land for development through marketing the space, as well as creating an environment for investment (infrastructure improvements, incentives).

Coordinate redevelopment with key partners such as GDOT, MARTA, DeKalb County, and the State of Georgia.

The potential of the GM site as well as the remaining study area is of tremendous scale, and Doraville does not have the resources to facilitate redevelopment on its own. It must rely on its local, state, and political partners to see the plan’s vision materialize. Doraville should create a structure where a coordinated and systematic effort to implement the recommendations of this plan occurs, with its partners having both an ownership as well as specific responsibilities outlined in the plan.
Engage GM more actively in redevelopment activities.

The City and its partners must more actively engage GM in the redevelopment of its site, creating direct lines of communication between the property owner, local governments, developers, and planners. This should include negotiating with GM for a reduced price for the sale of the former plant.

Engage state and federal leaders to lobby for special activities to incentivize new investment.

Doraville must work with state and federal agencies, including Georgia Department of Economic Development and Georgia Power, to build an incentive package to recruit investment and employment. Doraville should use its political resources to lobby elected officials for opportunities to provide these.

Promote multicultural understanding through events programming.

Doraville is truly a melting pot of cultures, businesses, and traditions. With so many groups of people, there is the potential to have separation between the communities. The best way to support a common understanding is to celebrate Doraville’s different cultures by creating unique and dedicated events that bring locals together, while also promoting Doraville’s diversity to the metro Atlanta market.

Market & Economic Development Projects

Flexible, user-friendly zoning that simplifies the entitlement process by establishing a clear understanding of the city’s expectations for development (O-1)

Doraville should look to simplify its existing zoning code, encouraging a better mix of businesses, while providing developers and investors a clear understanding of what is required of them. A more flexible code that mirrors the vision, mixture of uses, and design recommended in this LCI plan, will encourage rather than hinder a developer’s ability to build viable, creative projects that meet the goals of the plan.

GM site job recruitment (O-11)

From 1947 to 2008, the GM site had been a location for jobs and should continue to be targeted as a receiving area for employment, as well as other uses. Long-term employment targets for office and industry should be corporate headquarters, biotechnology and high-tech industries, as well as medical and life sciences. Short-term recruitment can focus on those businesses that can utilize the existing buildings on the site, prior to its full redevelopment.

“Micro-enterprise” program to provide seed capital for small businesses (O-12)

Small business programming can help grow or recruit independent businesses to a community, while filling vacant or underutilized spaces. Doraville should consider creating a program to provide seed capital for new business through financial incentives. Programming could include training for business and financial planning, marketing, etc., and could even incorporate a business incubator or shared office space. Doraville would need to partner with other agencies and institutions to accomplish many of these.

- Business license abatement. Forgiving annual business licenses or other fees for targeted businesses supported by this study.
- Business Planning. Sponsoring an annual business planning competition whereby one or more business owners with sound business plans could receive a small grant.
- Local grants. Many communities, often through a downtown development authority, sponsor small façade, general improvement, or even utilities grants to assist existing businesses improve their property, thus making it more marketable.
- Revolving Loan Funds. Doraville can approach local banks and private non-profits to create low-interest revolving loan pools for business startups, physical improvements, and down payment assistance for new businesses.
• **Marketing assistance.** Small marketing grants of $500 or less can be helpful in producing a sign, radio advertising, website development, or other activities.

• **Business incubator or shared office space.** Doraville should seek partnerships with DeKalb County, businesses, and nearby institutions of higher education to create a small business incubator in the study area. Incubators focus on entrepreneurship by providing support services such as low-cost office space and infrastructure, as well as business training and support opportunities. The recently vacated Center for Pan Asian Community Services should be studied as a potential location.

**Creation of “Technology village” west of the GM site to reflect existing land use patterns, existing large buildings, and proposed future access (O-13)**

As identified on the Framework Plan, the area between Peachtree Road and New Peachtree Road can be developed as a technology village. The area currently has a number of service and light industrial uses, and can be a future receiving area for new high tech industrial start-up businesses that utilize existing buildings and improved infrastructure. The village can be a location for a workforce training facility geared towards targeted and high-tech businesses, as well as a tech business incubator.

**Expanding Doraville’s existing logo and tagline into a comprehensive brand identity and marketing strategy (O-14)**

A community brand is not simply a logo and tagline. Rather, it is a graphic identity with a unique style, theme, color palette, typography, and overall message applied to a broader system positioning a community as a unique and special place. Doraville can make a strong statement as a place of diverse cultures, with a spirit of entrepreneurship that has seen people of all races and nationalities chose Doraville as a place to invest. That position is beginning to emerge in the multicultural nature of Doraville’s existing logo, and tagline of “Diversity, Vitality, Community”. Doraville should expand this statement by focusing on:

• **Quality of Life.** Positioning Doraville as a diverse and welcoming place with a family atmosphere.

• **Economic Opportunity.** Focusing on Doraville’s advantages of location, infrastructure, diversity, and investment potential.

Ultimately, Doraville should create a comprehensive system by first extending the current graphic identity to existing events, partner agencies, and collateral, followed by creating new marketing collateral to promote the community to a larger overall market.

**Community Improvement District (O-15)**

Doraville should pursue a Community Improvement District (CID) to help fund public infrastructure improvements and marketing along Buford Highway and in the remainder of the LCI study area. For a CID district, property owners within a geographically designated area would vote to impose a self-tax. The funds would be collected by the taxing authority and administered by a board of directors elected by the property owners within the district. The funds are then used to pay for or bond public improvements.
Branded wayfinding system (O-16)

A hierarchical system of signage should be implemented directing residents and visitors to civic, cultural, recreational, and commercial resources. A typical wayfinding system utilizes a community’s marketing brand graphics and includes gateways, vehicular and pedestrian trailblazers (directional signage), street banners, district & parking signs, building markers, and informational kiosks. Wayfinding systems should be designed to be an attractive, yet functional means of moving people throughout a community.

Brochure to market Doraville’s LCI vision to developers (O-17)

Doraville should create a plan brochure that is used market the plan, its vision and implementation strategies to potential investors, employers, state leaders and representatives of potential funding agencies. The brochure should be formatted as a graphic intensive executive summary of the plan, and can be distributed whenever a local official meets with prospects or other agencies.

Economic development focused marketing materials (O-18)

Due to its strategic location and wealth of infrastructure, Doraville has a tremendous opportunity to market itself for economic development. When the potential of the GM site is added, as well as the nearby
institutional assets such as the CDC and Emory University, this economic development position has a depth that makes Doraville one of the most significant economic development locations in the Southeast. The fact that Doraville has been a receiving ground for ethnic investment and entrepreneurship makes its position even more multi-faceted. Most communities like Doraville do not have the capacity or expertise to pursue economic development, and generally rely on industrial authorities or county economic development commissions for marketing. Considering the sheer scale of Doraville’s potential, it must get actively involved in promoting its economic and investment opportunities.

- **Business Recruitment Package.** A business recruitment brochure should be prepared as a more comprehensive marketing package. This would include inserts with demographics and workforce information, market research, incentive programs, available properties, and target industry ads.

- **Dedicated Economic Development website.** A dedicated website for economic development should be created to present Doraville’s tremendous advantages, as well as distill all other relevant information to potential investors and new businesses. The site should have its own address and not simply be a page on the City’s site.

- **Testimonial Ads.** Doraville can solicit testimonials from local businesses and investors who chose the community as a place to operate their business. As Doraville brings in additional businesses, new testimonials can be created that detail from the businesses’ perspective, why Doraville is a place to invest.

- **Property sheets for key development sites.** In addition to the GM site, Doraville has a number of underdeveloped or vacant sites and spaces. A template should be made as a one-page property sheet highlighting individual sites with the greatest potential. The property sheets can be print and web based, and should include all relevant information including size, cost, condition, infrastructure, zoning, etc.

- **Consistency of materials.** It is critically important that all economic development materials be consistent in their design and overall message. This ensures that Doraville is creating a brand identity with a strong message of its economic development potential.

**Consideration of establishing a Tax Allocation District on GM site (O-19)**

Tax allocation districts (TADs) are innovative ways to pay for public infrastructure improvements that spur private development within a study area. They are most effective when a private sector project is eminent, or when a key area such as the GM site has redevelopment potential. Doraville is currently working to establish local legislation authorizing it to exercise its redevelopment powers and create TADs. Once complete, it would then create and approve a redevelopment plan that outlines public projects, private investment projections, and increment estimates. A successful TAD will require the cooperation of DeKalb County and the Board or Education, as well as the general public.

**Establishment of an Opportunity Zone to provide state job credits to new or expanding businesses in the study area (O-20)**

With the GM site being a future receiving area for new employment uses, Doraville should establish an Opportunity Zone providing an incentive for business investment. Doraville would designate a district based on criteria established by the State Department of Community Affairs. Once established, new or existing businesses that create two or more jobs can receive tax credits of $3,500 per job. With many other communities across the metro area designating these zones, it is even more important for Doraville to do the same to remain competitive for economic development.

**Creation of a downtown development authority for the City of Doraville (O-21)**

Established through local law, a downtown development authority (DDA) would focus on the revitalization and redevelopment of downtown business districts by planning and financing projects to promote trade, commerce, industry, and employment. In Doraville’s case, the district would likely include the municipal core as well as commercial areas along both Buford Highway and New Peachtree. A DDA’s structure
is outlined in Georgia Downtown Development Authority Law, which gives the body the power to conduct a number of economic development activities. These can include property acquisition and disposition, applying for federal and state grants, long-range planning, and other activities that Doraville does not currently have the capacity to do.

**Economic Development Commission (O-22)**

Prior to establishing a DDA, Doraville should set up an economic development commission (EDC) with an advisory board per the guidelines established for the “Entrepreneur Friendly” designation from the Georgia Department of Economic Development. The EDC should be made up of business owners, residents, public officials, and other, not unlike the LCI Core Team.

**Small business tool kit (O-23)**

The proposed DDA or economic development commission should create a small business toolkit and pamphlet in various languages on how to do business in Doraville. Many residents and business owners come from countries fraught with government corruption. The toolkit could communicate what is expected out of them as responsible business owners and what they can expect out of the City as a responsible government.

**Streamlined permitting (O-24)**

The proposed DDA, EDC, and related boards should work to streamline permitting and licensing.

**Expedited plan review (O-25)**

Expedited plan review can be a major boon for redevelopment. Doraville should establish protocols wherein projects consistent with the vision of this plan are approved more quickly than others.

**Reenergizing the Doraville Business Association (O-26)**

Similarly, Doraville should look to other partners to facilitate this plan and revitalization. The Doraville Business Association (DBA) was established to represent businesses and organizations that want to promote and do business in the community. A membership driven organization led by a board and volunteers, the DBA has become less active in recent years. The DBA should be reenergized with two specific responsibilities related to this plan.

- Facilitating cooperative marketing and advertising, networking, and providing a common voice for small business interests and communication with city government.
- Partnering with business, civic, and cultural organizations to provide business development and support specifically to ethnic businesses within the community.
Marketing materials highlighting existing businesses (O-27)

Print and web brochures are effective in promoting individual businesses, both to visitors and locals. Doraville should create a shopping and dining guide highlighting area businesses. A similar but separate guide can be created for locals that maps out grocery stores and other basic needs. It is important that any marketing material utilizes Doraville’s marketing brand, and that all materials are consistent in design.

Doraville marketing publication that promote cross-cultural patronage of existing businesses (O-28)

Similarly, a guide should be created geared to locals that celebrates Doraville’s multi-cultural business environment, and promotes cross-cultural patronage of these businesses.

Event to promote area restaurants and the Farmers Market (O-29)

Doraville’s multiculturalism is one of its greatest assets, and its variety of food-based businesses and restaurants is a testament to this. Doraville should create an annual event, featuring local restaurants and cultures. The event would not only target the metro region to come sample the culture and flavor of Doraville, but also promote patronage from local residents.

Workforce training for area residents geared towards target industries (O-30)

Doraville should partner with area institutions of higher education, the Small Business Development Center, Georgia Department of Economic Development, and private industries to provide workforce training to support targeted industries (medical, biotech, life science, data centers, green technology). The Park Avenue property owned by the City and recently vacated by the Center for Pan Asian Community Services could potentially be a location to house this training, as well as other uses such as a small business incubator.

Georgia Foreign Trade Zone (O-31)

The Georgia Foreign Trade Zone (GFTZ) exists to help Georgia businesses compete internationally by deferring or reducing customs duties, processing fees and international trading operation costs. It goes hand-in-hand with the proposed Opportunity Zone, and, in fact, some of the criteria for establishing them are the same.

Sister City program (O-32)

The Sister Cities program began in 1956, when a people-to-people citizen diplomacy initiative was proposed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, as part of the League of Nations. In 1967, as a result of extraordinary growth of the program, the Sister Cities Initiative (SCI) became a separate, nonprofit organization. Doraville’s involvement in the program would foster global cooperation and understanding, cultural awareness and economic development through its sister city relationships with municipalities in other countries.

Foreign holiday commemoration (O-33)

Doraville should continue to commemorate foreign national holidays with public proclamation ceremonies, especially for the nations with consulates here in Atlanta as well as other major trade nations with a significant ethnic presence in the area. As the area redevelops, such efforts could establish Doraville as an ideal location for consulates and foreign trade organizations to concentrate.
**Internet marketing program for economic development (O-34)**
Each year, the internet becomes an increasingly important economic development tool. The City of Doraville should embrace this trend and establish a website targeted towards economic development efforts.

**City of Doraville GIS system (O-35)**
Accurate geographic information systems (GIS) mapping is critical to economic development and governance. Currently Doraville relies on DeKalb County for said services, which unnecessarily complicates the process and makes it difficult to provide accurate, up-to-date mapping to for public or private use.

To remedy this, Doraville should follow the path of Decatur and other DeKalb County cities and began to manage their own mapping by establishing a GIS system. The exact nature of said system could take many forms, and the City should explore all options and associated costs before determining which is ideal.
4.5 Urban Design & Historic Resources

As public and private investment occurs, attention to design will be critical to creating a place with a strong identity and lasting value. Central to this will be building on the area’s history, while recognizing that its future must incorporate timeless place-making principles from the best town and city centers across the region.

Urban Design & Historic Resource Policies

Require good urban design standards in most area.

Basic elements of urbanism should be required for all new developments. These include:

- Buildings built close to the street
- Doors accessible from the sidewalk along key walking streets
- Active ground floor uses
- Storefronts, stoops, and porches along the sidewalk
- Pedestrian-scaled signs
- Front yards used for pedestrian purposes such as outdoor dining, landscaping, or porches
- No gated communities surrounded by fencing, or private streets that do not connect to surrounding streets
- Parking to the side or rear of the building, except on major streets (e.g. Peachtree Boulevard or Buford Highway) where some frontal parking is appropriate

These should be incorporated into proposed zoning updates.

Support architectural standards that allow a variety of styles, but require good design.

Buildings should not be restricted to one particular style, but they should utilize quality materials. Façades faced in brick, stone, and similar materials are preferred for commercial and mixed-use buildings, while a greater range is appropriate for residential.

Develop a town center with civic, open space, and diverse commercial uses connected by a pleasant pedestrian environment within a convenient walk of the MARTA station.

Please see the Town Center Concept on pages 94 and 95.

Promote relocation of power lines off of New Peachtree Road.

Utility relocation is expensive, but should be a long-term priority along Doraville’s future “Main Street.”

Encourage the preservation of the area’s few remaining historic buildings and façades.

Doraville only has a handful of remaining historic buildings. These should be preserved and incorporated into new development.
Incorporate art, monuments, and memorials in public spaces. The installation of a variety of art projects in proposed streetscape projects and open spaces should enliven them and provide interest. Partnerships with local artists are encouraged.

Create pocket parks with intersection improvements or road construction, especially where unbuildable sites remain. Proposed transportation projects will create a variety of opportunities for small pocket parks.

Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles. Design can support or discourage crime. Techniques that minimize opportunities for crime and support policing should be incorporated into new projects. Please see pages 124 and 125 for details.

Avoid corporate prototype architecture. Chains have an important role in the area’s future, but their design should respond to the future vision. Generic prototype architecture is discouraged in favor of designs that reflect traditional materials, styles, and building placement found in Georgia’s town centers.

Urban Design & Historic Resource Projects

GM site and town center zoning (O-1) The proposed zoning should incorporate design standards that ensure appropriate design and quality. Please see Land Use Projects for more details.

Buford Highway zoning (O-2) The proposed zoning should incorporate design standards that ensure appropriate design and quality. Please see Land Use Projects for more details.

Design guidelines (O-36) Design standards should be established to improve the quality of development. They should balance the economics of development with the need for quality design to ensure they do not stifle growth.

Historic signs and markers in the study area (O-37) Historic markers would convey the study area’s history.

Gateway features Install signs or public art at key locations, including:

- Shallowford Road and Buford Highway (O-38)
- New Peachtree Road and Shallowford Road, perhaps in the proposed traffic circle (O-39)
- I-285 and Buford Highway (O-40)
- MARTA entrances at Park and Central Avenues (O-41)
Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

The following summarizes elements of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles. It was compiled using information from wikipedia.com accessed on May 20, 2010.

CPTED is a multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through design. Its strategies rely upon the ability to influence offender decisions that precede criminal acts. Research into criminal behavior shows that the decision to offend or not to offend is more influenced by cues to the perceived risk of being caught than by cues to reward or ease of entry. Consistent with this research, CPTED strategies emphasize enhancing the perceived risk of detection and apprehension.

Natural surveillance

Natural surveillance increases the threat of apprehension by taking steps to increase the perception that people can be seen. Natural surveillance occurs by designing the placement of physical features, activities and people in such a way as to maximize visibility and foster positive social interaction among legitimate users of private and public space. Potential offenders feel increased scrutiny and limitations on their escape routes.

- Place windows overlooking sidewalks and parking lots.
- Leave window shades open.
- Use passing vehicular traffic as a surveillance asset.
- Create landscape designs that provide surveillance, especially in proximity to designated points of entry and opportunistic points of entry.
- Use the shortest, least sight-limiting fence appropriate for the situation.
- Use transparent weather vestibules at building entrances.
- When designing lighting, avoid poorly placed lights that create blind-spots for potential observers and miss critical areas. Ensure potential problem areas are well-lit: pathways, stairs, entrances/exits, parking areas, ATMs, phone kiosks, mailboxes, bus stops, children’s play areas, recreation areas, pools, laundry rooms, storage areas, dumpster and recycling areas, etc.
- Avoid too-bright security lighting that creates blinding glare and/or deep shadows, hindering the view for potential observers. Eyes adapt to night lighting and have trouble adjusting to severe lighting disparities. Using lower intensity lights often requires more fixtures.
- Use shielded or cut-off luminaires to control glare.
- Place lighting along pathways and other pedestrian-use areas at proper heights for lighting the faces of the people in the space (and to identify the faces of potential attackers).

Natural surveillance measures can be complemented by mechanical and organizational measures. For example, closed-circuit cameras can be added where window surveillance is unavailable.

Natural access control

Natural access control limits the opportunity for crime by taking steps to clearly differentiate between public space and private space. By selectively placing entrances and exits, fencing, lighting and landscape to limit access or control flow, natural access control occurs.

- Use a single, clearly identifiable, point of entry
- Use structures to divert persons to reception areas
- Incorporate maze entrances in public restrooms. This avoids the isolation that is produced by an anteroom or double door entry system
- Use low, thorny bushes beneath ground level windows.
- Eliminate design features that provide access to roofs or upper levels
- In the front yard, use waist-level, picket-type fencing along residential property lines to control access, encourage surveillance.
- Use a locking gate between front and backyards.
- Use shoulder-level, open-type fencing along lateral residential property lines between side yards and extending to between back yards. They should be sufficiently unencumbered with landscaping to promote social interaction between neighbors.
- Use substantial, high, closed fencing (for example, masonry) between backyards and alleys.

Natural access control is used to complement mechanical and operational access control measures, such as target hardening.

**Natural territorial reinforcement**

Territorial reinforcement promotes social control through increased definition of space and improved proprietary concern. An environment designed to clearly delineate private space does two things. First, it creates a sense of ownership. Owners have a vested interest and are more likely to challenge intruders or report them to the police. Second, the sense of owned space creates an environment where “strangers” or “intruders” stand out and are more easily identified. By using buildings, fences, pavement, signs, lighting and landscape to express ownership and define public, semi-public and private space, natural territorial reinforcement occurs. Additionally, these objectives can be achieved by assignment of space to designated users in previously unassigned locations.

- Maintained premises and landscaping such that it communicates an alert and active presence occupying the space.
- Provide trees in residential areas. Research results indicate that, contrary to traditional views within the law enforcement community, outdoor residential spaces with more trees are seen as significantly more attractive, safer, and more likely to be used than similar spaces without trees.
- Restrict private activities to defined private areas.
- Display security system signage at access points.
- Avoid cyclone fencing and razor-wire fence topping, as it communicates the absence of a physical presence and a reduced risk of being detected.
- Placing amenities such as seating or refreshments in common areas in a commercial or institutional setting helps to attract larger numbers of desired users.
- Scheduling activities in common areas increases proper use, attracts more people and increases the perception that these areas are controlled.

Territorial reinforcement measures make the normal user feel safe and make the potential offender aware of a substantial risk of apprehension or scrutiny.

**Maintenance**

Maintenance is an expression of ownership of property. Deterioration indicates less control by the intended users of a site and indicates a greater tolerance of disorder. The Broken Windows Theory is a valuable tool in understanding the importance of maintenance in deterring crime. Broken Windows theory proponents support a zero tolerance approach to property maintenance, observing that the presence of a broken window will entice vandals to break more windows in the vicinity. The sooner broken windows are fixed, the less likely it is that such vandalism will occur in the future.
4.6 Public Facilities & Spaces

As the study area redevelops into the higher intensity uses envisioned in the Framework Plan it will be necessary to upgrade public facilities and spaces to serve the growing community. The following recommendations provide guidance on how to do this in an incremental way that achieves the long-term vision, while reflecting current limited resources.

Public Facilities Policies

Construct civic buildings and facilities that set the standard for the type of high quality development desired in the area.

Public buildings are more than places to conduct government business; they are symbols of the values and identity of the communities they represent. As such, they should set models for the standard of architecture that a community aspires to. Cheap civic buildings encourage cheap private development nearby.

Prior to their replacement, support improvements to facilities such as the library, the pool, and civic center.

In lieu of possible long-term redevelopment, existing public buildings should be improved as funding becomes available.

Promote affordable space for non-profits.

Private non-profit organizations have an important role to play in serving the community. However, such organizations can seldom pay “market rent” for office space. Low-cost office space for non-profits should be encouraged in the study area.

Encourage child care centers, adult day care centers and in-home nursing care providers.

To be truly diverse, the greater Doraville community must serve people of different ages. Child care centers, adult day care centers, and in-home nursing care provides are essential to this.

Promote the creation of community facilities, including health services, that are pedestrian and/or transit accessible.

New community facilities should be located in areas where they are accessible to people without cars. Placing them in areas served by transit and quality pedestrian access will maximize their use.

Encourage public agencies conducting outreach efforts and materials in multiple languages.

Public outreach should serve the many cultural backgrounds in the area by providing program materials in a variety of languages.

Require utility burial on all new streets.

Electric and other above ground utility wires should be underground to avoid harming aesthetics and interfering with trees. While this is...
not an inexpensive proposition, it is essential to create a place of lasting value. Furthermore, by burying utilities when new streets are built, rather than years later, the costs are greatly reduced.

Cooperate with existing infrastructure providers and neighboring jurisdictions for input on water quality planning.

Water quality issues do not stop at political boundaries, and neither should planning for improved water quality. The Cities of Doraville and Chamblee, and DeKalb County are encouraged to work together to improve water quality in the greater Doraville area.

Public Facilities Projects

Police Station relocation to north of study area on New Peachtree Road (O-42)

A new police station should eventually be built outside of the study area near the tank farm. While this may take decades, it is essential to creating the long-term vision for the town center area.

Consolidated government center either in the town center area or at the redeveloped GM site (O-43)

As the City of Doraville grows it may be necessary to create a new government building. Multiple uses could be incorporated into this building including the current city hall, the court, the civic center, the health clinic, and the other smaller uses scattered around the city. Public meeting and events space could also be included.

Sites for this building could include the current city-owned land in the town center, or with the redeveloped GM site. The final decision of where to locate should only be made after the City has considered the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios.

Community center that includes meeting space and facilities for small events such as weddings, family reunions, or community festivals (O-44)

Public spaces in the proposed town center and GM site could be desirable places for weddings, family reunions, or community festivals. Adjacent to one, a community center should be created to generate revenue for the City of Doraville and meet this need.

Stormwater management plan (O-45)

Doraville should develop a plan to reduce the impact of increased runoff from development and explore options to remove pollutants.

Public Space Policies

Incorporate parks and open spaces into large redevelopments, such as the GM site.

Development sites greater than ten acres can easily accommodate pocket parks or plazas. Typically, such only needs to be between five and ten percent of the site’s area if designed well.
Promote parks and plazas where public events can occur.
Public spaces over one-quarter acre should be designed to accommodate public events.

Provide a location for “Saturday morning” farmer’s market.
A weekly farmer’s market could provide locally grown food not currently available in the area. Initially it could be in a parking lot or vacant area, but longer term a permanent space may be possible.

Encourage an appropriate relationship between parks and adjacent development.
New development adjacent to public spaces should front them with doors, windows, and walkways. Parking decks, loading zones, dumpsters, or similar uses should be minimized and hidden from view in these areas. New, publicly-accessible streets should be created to separate parks from new development where feasible.

Encourage the creation of shared stormwater facilities and those integrated into parks.
Shared facilities can reduce the cost to individual developers and the amount of land dedicated to stormwater retention. In addition, they can often be designed as community assets and integrated into planned public spaces, such as proposed GM site parks.

Public Space Projects

GM site and town center zoning (O-1, O-3)
The proposed zoning should incorporate minimum standards for new public spaces in large development projects, including striving to codify the three key open spaces shown in the GM Site Redevelopment Concepts.
Please see Land Use Projects for more details.

At the Glenwood Park in Atlanta a shared stormwater facility (above right) serves multiple building sites and doubles as a park space. During periods of heavy rain the green lawn above fills with water. The rest of the time it is a highly-used public park. A similar model should be explored on the GM site.

A Saturday farmer’s market could be established within a new park, or even an existing parking lot.

Open spaces should be bounded by streets fronted with buildings.
Open Space Projects

The following will improve the quality of the public realm as the study area redevelops:
1. Doraville Town Square
2. Flowers Park Reconfiguration
3. Bubbling Creek Linear Park
4. Bubbling Creek Park (GM site)
5. The Square (GM site)
6. The Green (GM site)
7. Railside Multi-Use Path
8. Chestnut Drive Trail or Bicycle Facilities
9. Traffic Circle

Additional small open spaces and potential multi-use trail connections are shown for illustrative purposes.
Buford Highway zoning (O-2)
The proposed zoning should incorporate standards for new public spaces in large development sites. 
Please see Land Use Projects for more details.

New town square with space for outdoor performances (O-46)
A portion of the current police station site represents an ideal location for a new town square ringed with streets and mixed-use buildings. The proposed 1.2 acre park is large enough to accommodate a small performance space that could take advantage of existing topography along the Park Avenue frontage.

Renovation and reconfiguration of Flowers Park around the pool (O-47)
Flowers Park today is a park in name only. As redevelopment occurs it should be reconfigured into a larger 1.3 acre space around the existing pool to create a quiet gathering spot that can be used by existing and future residents.

Linear park along Bubbling Creek (O-48)
The banks of Bubbling Creek exiting from the former GM site west should be preserved in perpetuity as a 6.3 acre linear park. Such could even extend west into existing Chamblee neighborhoods.

GM Site: The Square (O-49)
Please see the GM Site Redevelopment Concept for details.

GM Site: The Green (O-50)
Please see the GM Site Redevelopment Concept for details.

GM Site: Bubbling Creek Park (O-51)
Please see the GM Site Redevelopment Concept for details.
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5.1 Action Plan

This Action Plan outlines the next steps after the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI Study is adopted by the City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee. The Action Matrix, provided on the following pages, lists all proposed projects, along with timelines, responsible parties, and cost estimates. The matrix is intended to serve as a blueprint for achieving the community's vision for the future.

In order to ensure implementation, continued diligence will be required on the part of area residents, businesses, City of Doraville and City of Chamblee governments, and other organizations. These groups must monitor development and public improvements in the study area to ensure that they are consistent with the vision embodied in the plan. Specifically, local governments and private developers must work together to ensure that land use and zoning changes supporting the vision are implemented satisfactorily.

Most recommendations are provided on an aggressive five year timeline, although some clearly extend beyond this time period as funding becomes available. Projects in the near future represent those addressing areas with the most critical need for public improvement or those where public investment can spur private investment. Longer-term projects are less urgent, but equally key to the ultimate success of this study.

Community Priorities

During the public outreach process it became evident that four plan recommendations were of high priority to the Core Team and the public at-large. These include:

- New Peachtree Road Pedestrian Facilities (T-1a)
- Park Avenue Pedestrian Facilities (T-1b)
- Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector (T-9)
- Rail transit from Perimeter Center to Doraville (T-26)

While the two pedestrian facilities are of a size that they could be implemented using LCI funds, the proposed Buford-Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector is a regionally significant project that will require the participation of GDOT, ARC, the Federal Government, and others to be realized. It is nevertheless central to the vision of the plan. Without it and the vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access it provides, many of the land use elements of this plan are not feasible.

Local Funding

Through LCI studies, the ARC has committed to making funding available for the implementation of plan elements related to transportation and to pre-qualify a limited number of transportation projects for funding. Their expressed desire is for public infrastructure
improvements to spur private investment in existing activity centers. Transportation projects may also be funded through a variety of other sources administered through the ARC. The City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee should work with ARC staff to ensure that projects requiring transportation funds are included in future Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), which are revised every five years. Most transportation funds administered by the ARC will require a 20 percent local match.

Sources for the local match funds could include:

- **Proposed Tax Allocation District (TAD):** If a TAD is created within the study area, bond funds can be used to pay for eligible public and private improvements within the district.

- **Proposed Community Improvement District (CID):** If a TAD is created within the study area, it will have a critical role in providing matching funds for transportation projects, and completing many of the marketing recommendations of the plan.

- **Private donations:** Local matches could be obtained by soliciting area property owners, businesses, residents, and institutions. Private funds may also be used to fund specific “special interest” projects. For example, the PATH Foundation funds multi-use greenway trails, while the Trust for Public Land and the Blank Foundation sometimes fund park projects.

Without a detailed analysis that is beyond the scope of this study, the ideal source for local match funds cannot be determined. However, all available options should be carefully explored.

**Steps Toward Implementation**

This LCI contains an aggressive but achievable plan for growth in the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI study area. For the vision to become a reality there must be both short and long-term commitments to its principles. The following steps are intended to guide the short and long-term implementation processes.

**Short Term**

Short term implementation should strive to remove regulatory barriers to the vision contained herein. After plan approval by the City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee, its recommendations should be officially adopted into their comprehensive plans. As part of this, specific policies for the area should be noted, although changes to the future land use map are not necessary.

Equally important, a new zoning district should be created to legalize the plan vision and encourage compatible development. Please see Section 5.2 for details on these.

**Long Term**

The realization of the LCI vision will also require a long-term commitment. The plan’s aggressive vision cannot be achieved overnight, and if it is not consulted and reviewed regularly, it risks becoming obsolete.

As the City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee move forward with implementing the vision of this study, it is critical that the following be kept in mind:

- **The Vision:** Of all of the components of this study, the vision should represent its most lasting legacy. The ideas contained in Part 4.1: Future Vision represent the results of an inclusive public involvement process. It is unlikely that the general vision and goals resulting from this process will change significantly, even though the steps to achieving them may.

- **Flexibility:** While the vision is unlikely to change in the near future, it is critical that the community recognize that the ways in which the vision is achieved can and will change. The future addition or subtraction of policies or projects should not be viewed as a compromise of the study, but rather its
natural evolution in response to new conditions. Many of the assumptions used to guide this process, including the economic climate, land costs, transportation costs, transportation funding programs, and development trends, are never fixed. The City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee must be prepared to respond to changes in order to ensure a relevant plan.

- **Development Guide**: One of the greatest long-term values of this document, in addition to its role in procuring transportation funding, is that it lays out a detailed land use framework. All future development proposals should be reviewed for compatibility with the framework.

By being mindful of these three concepts, the 2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI Study can guide positive change in and around the area for years to come.

*Transportation Project Map*

The map on the following page shows all proposed transportation projects that have a specific location within the study area. Project numbers refer to the Action Matrix on the following pages.

*Cost Assumptions*

As with any macro-level planning process, it is impossible to assign exact costs to future projects. However, it is possible to produce cost estimates based on standard unit cost assumptions. The following unit cost assumptions are used in the Action Matrices. Where project costs have already been estimated by another study, the other study’s costs are used. All costs are in 2011 dollars.
Figure 5.1: Transportation Project Map
### Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Length of Project (ft)</th>
<th>Cost per Linear Foot</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>Significant pedestrian and bicycle facilities along multiple routes within the study area.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,976,760</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,735</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,298,000</td>
<td>$20,698,460</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1a</td>
<td>New Peachtree Road from Stewart Road to Flowers Park. Includes road diet with separated bike path and sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and 4 new traffic signals at existing intersections.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle / Vehicular</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$2,580,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1b</td>
<td>Park Avenue from New Peachtree Road to Buford Highway. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, sharrow markings and a new traffic signal with Buford Highway.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle / Vehicular</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1c</td>
<td>Shallowford Road from Buford Highway to New Peachtree Road. Includes separated bike path, sidewalk, landscaping, and pedestrian lighting.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$364,800</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$3,040,000</td>
<td>$3,480,800</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1d</td>
<td>Peachtree Road from Peachtree Boulevard to Proposed Connector. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and bike lanes.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$561,600</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4,680,000</td>
<td>$5,358,600</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1e</td>
<td>Buford Highway from Park Avenue to i-285. Includes sidewalk renovation, pedestrian lighting, and bike facilities to match features of adjacent proposed TE project.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$148,800</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>$1,388,800</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1f</td>
<td>Church Street from Central Avenue to Stewart Road. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and sharrow markings.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$697,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1g</td>
<td>King Avenue from New Peachtree Road to Church Street. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and sharrow markings.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$206,100</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1h</td>
<td>Jess Norman Way from Buford Highway to Stewart Road. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, and a new traffic signal with Buford Highway.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$627,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1i</td>
<td>Stewart Road from Jess Norman Way to Stewart Court. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, and pedestrian lighting.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$87,360</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td>$833,560</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1j</td>
<td>Chestnut Drive from Buford Highway to Pineland Avenue. Includes pedestrian facilities and a bicycle lanes/path connecting to proposed North Fork Peachtree Creek Trail.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,832,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1k</td>
<td>North Peachtree Road from Peachtree Boulevard to Peachtree Road. Includes sidewalk, landscaping, pedestrian lighting and sharrow markings.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$297,600</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$2,480,000</td>
<td>$2,839,600</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type of Improvement</td>
<td>Engineering Year</td>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>ROW Year</td>
<td>ROW Costs</td>
<td>Length of Project (ft)</td>
<td>Cost per Linear Foot</td>
<td>Construction Year</td>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>Development of citywide standards for street furniture, trees, and lighting to be used on all proposed pedestrian facility projects.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>Peachtree Boulevard from North Peachtree Road to I-285. Fill in missing sidewalk gaps along both sides of the road.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$211,600</td>
<td>City, TE, LCI</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4*</td>
<td>Walking path along Bubbling Creek from the General Motors Site to North Peachtree Road to connect the Cities of Chamblee and Doraville.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>City, Private Chamblee</td>
<td>SPLOST, CDBG, TE, LCI, CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5*</td>
<td>Pedestrian access to the Buford Highway Corridor through Pinetree Plaza from the Northwoods neighborhood.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6</td>
<td>Pedestrian bridge across the existing MARTA rail lines connecting the eastern half of Doraville with the re-development site.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,780,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-7*</td>
<td>Multi-use path from Peachtree Road along the northwest side of the freight line with a bridge over I-285 to Flowers Road.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$283,500</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2,362,500</td>
<td>$3,066,000</td>
<td>City, Private Chamblee</td>
<td>SPLOST, CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>Installation of bike racks at City owned buildings and parks throughout the study area to promote bicycle use.</td>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicular**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Year</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Length of Project (ft)</th>
<th>Cost per Linear Foot</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>Buford Highway-Peachtree Boulevard Connector, a regionally significant road along the western edge of study area to provide vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access across MARTA.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$3,267,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$4,538</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$27,225,000</td>
<td>$48,492,000</td>
<td>GDOT, Chamblee, LCI, DeKalb, Private</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$3,267,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>Street Realignment</td>
<td>Roadway Operations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,128,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,290,000</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$68,070,000</td>
<td>$123,488,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10a</td>
<td>Realign Chestnut Drive with Park Avenue it create a centralized route from Northwoods to MARTA. This improvement would warrant reclassifying Park Avenue as an Urban Collector.</td>
<td>Roadway Operations</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,672,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10b</td>
<td>Realign Clearview Avenue with Jess Norman Way to eliminate the existing intersection of Clearview Ave and Buford Highway to reduce congestion near the I-285 interchange.</td>
<td>Roadway Operations</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$1,054,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>Convert the Central Avenue/Buford Highway intersection to a right-in, right-out only. This will eliminate congestion along both roads.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Projects (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Year</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Length of Project (ft)</th>
<th>Cost per Linear Foot</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-12</td>
<td>Free flow right turn lane from Buford Highway northbound to I-285 eastbound to eliminate storage congestion on Buford Highway during peak traffic hours.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$1,116,000</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-13</td>
<td>Addition of another eastbound through lane on Motor Industrial Way onto I-285 eastbound ramp to eliminate storage congestion on Motor Industrial Way during peak traffic hours.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-14</td>
<td>Extension of the Buford Highway I-285 exit ramp to Creston Drive connecting to New Peachtree Road; removing truck traffic from Buford Highway and providing a more direct access to MARTA.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,680,000</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-15</td>
<td>Construction of a traffic circle at New Peachtree Road/Shallowford Road intersection to provide continuous traffic flow and eliminate the existing misaligned intersection.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$3,232,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$2,352,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16</td>
<td>New publicly funded streets within study area</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,256,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22,920,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,805,000</td>
<td>$43,981,600</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$28,937,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16a</td>
<td>Oakmal Avenue west from Buford Highway to New Peachtree Rd. This new road will help spill the existing super-block. Includes pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$3,662,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$2,582,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16b</td>
<td>Realign Pinetree Plaza entrance to align with new street from Pinetree Plaza Driveway to proposed traffic circle. Includes pedestrian and bicycle facilities with a new signal Buford Highway.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$4,676,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$3,836,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16c</td>
<td>Extend Terrell Drive to Peachtree Road. Eliminates the existing cul-de-sac to improve police and fire response routes.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$46,200</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>$781,200</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$473,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16d</td>
<td>Extend John Glenn Drive to Peachtree Road. Eliminates the existing cul-de-sac to improve police and fire response routes.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$59,400</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$1,004,400</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$608,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16e</td>
<td>New street from Shallowford Road to Central Ave. A road paralleling Buford Highway to help reduce the number of driveways access along Buford Highway. Includes pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$774,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$16,250,000</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
<td>$23,474,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$18,314,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16f</td>
<td>New street with bridge from Flowers Rd over I-285 to GM Plant Site. This new road would give Doraville residents west of I-285 with access to the new redevelopment site.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,089,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$9,075,000</td>
<td>$10,384,000</td>
<td>City, GDOT, Private</td>
<td>SPLOST, GDOT, Private</td>
<td>$3,124,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-17</td>
<td>Addition of way finding signage at the intersection near important City buildings to serve all types of transportation users.</td>
<td>Vehicular / Pedestrian</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Projects (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Year</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Length of Project (ft)</th>
<th>Cost per Linear Foot</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-18</td>
<td>Addition of Georgia Navigator signage on north and southbound Buford Highway alerting motorists of I-285 traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Roadway Operations</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-19</td>
<td>Addition of I-285 eastbound ramp access directly from Stewart Road. This ramp reconfiguration would eliminate vehicles traveling to Buford Highway to gain access to I-285.</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$52,800</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$692,800</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>GDOT, SPLOST</td>
<td>SPLOST, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-20</td>
<td>New privately funded street network built with the redevelopment of the GM site to provide multiple access points and routes throughout the development.</td>
<td>Roadway Operations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$25,300,000</td>
<td>$25,300,000</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transit

| ID   | Description                                                                 | Type of Improvement | Engineering Year | Engineering Costs | ROW Year | ROW Costs | Length of Project (ft) | Construction Year | Construction Costs | Total Project Costs | Responsible Party | Funding Source | Local Source & Match Amount |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|---------|-----------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| T-21 | MARTA on-train announcement updates to highlight positive attributes of Doraville | Transit             | n/a              | n/a              | n/a     | n/a       | -                      | City                 | City             | SPLOST, City     | n/a                |
| T-22 | Construction of a West Concourse to the existing Doraville MARTA station to provide rail transit access to the new re-development site. | Transit             | -                | n/a              | -       | n/a       | -                      | $20,000,000         | Private           | Private          | Private            | n/a             |
| T-23 | Bus rapid transit on Buford Highway from the Lindbergh MARTA station to Pleasant Hill Road | Transit / Vehicular | -                | $0               | -       | n/a       | -                      | n/a                 | GDOT             | GDOT, SPLOST      | SPLOST, City     | n/a             |
| T-24 | Transit ITS on Buford Highway from Sidney Marcus to Pleasant Hill Road      | Transit / Vehicular | -                | $0               | -       | n/a       | -                      | n/a                 | GDOT             | GDOT, SPLOST      | SPLOST, City     | n/a             |
| T-25 | Construction of a new MARTA parking deck for commuters on the west side of the existing MARTA rail lines. | Transit             | -                | n/a              | -       | n/a       | -                      | $10,000,000         | Private           | Private          | Private            | n/a            |
| T-26*| Construction of light rail transit along I-285 connecting the City of Doraville with the City of Dunwoody and areas beyond. | Transit             | -                | n/a              | -       | n/a       | -                      | n/a                 | Private           | Private          | Private            | n/a            |
| T-27*| Extension of rail transit into Gwinnett County.                              | Transit             | -                | $0               | -       | n/a       | -                      | n/a                 | Private           | Private          | Private            | n/a            |

* Project partially or completely outside the LCI study area
** Already designed
All cost estimates are in 2010 dollars
CDBG: Federal Community Development Block Grant
GDOT: Georgia Department of Transportation
LCI: Livable Centers Initiative
SPLOST: Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax
CMAQ: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
TE: Federal Transportation Enhancement

Totals: $4,233,640 $46,946,300 $139,971,940 $31,915,340
### Other Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part 5: Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>Town Center zoning</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>Buford Highway zoning</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville, ARC</td>
<td>ARC Community Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>GM Site rezoning</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>Expanded residential code enforcement</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5</td>
<td>GM Site redevelopment</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6</td>
<td>Town Center redevelopment</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville/Private</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7</td>
<td>MARTA RFP and development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8</td>
<td>Buford Highway corridor and parking bio-retention</td>
<td>$1.5 - $2.0 million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>GDOT, Private</td>
<td>EPA grants, GA grants, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9</td>
<td>Clean up and restoration of Bubbling Creek</td>
<td>$80k - $120k</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Chamblee</td>
<td>EPA grants, 5 Star, GA grants, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-10</td>
<td>GM Site remediation (if required by Federal law)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marks and Economic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-11</td>
<td>GM site job recruitment</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City, DeKalb County, GM, State of GA</td>
<td>City, DeKalb County, GM, State of GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-12</td>
<td>“Micro-enterprise” program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business License Abatement for targeted businesses</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011-</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Incubator</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>City, Higher Ed Partner, DeKalb County EDC</td>
<td>City, CDBG, SBDC, Non-profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-13</td>
<td>Technology village</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-14</td>
<td>Expanding logo/tagline into a brand identity/marketing strategy</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-15</td>
<td>Community Improvement District (CID)</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-16</td>
<td>Branded wayfinding system</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See project T-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-17</td>
<td>Brochure to market LCI vision</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-18</td>
<td>Economic development focused marketing materials</td>
<td>$5k - $10k</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville, DeKalb County EDC</td>
<td>City, DeKalb County EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated ED website</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testimonial ads</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville, DeKalb County EDC</td>
<td>City, DeKalb County EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property sheets</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-19</td>
<td>Consideration of a Tax Allocation District</td>
<td>$15k - $20k</td>
<td>2012-</td>
<td>City, County, Schools</td>
<td>City, ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-20</td>
<td>Establishing an Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-21</td>
<td>Creation of a Downtown Development Authority (DDA)</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-22</td>
<td>Economic development commission (EDC)</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Projects (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-23</td>
<td>Small business toolkit</td>
<td>$5,000 - $7,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville, DDA/EDC</td>
<td>City, DDA/EDC, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-24</td>
<td>Streamlined permitting</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-25</td>
<td>Expeditied Plan Review</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-26</td>
<td>Reenergizing Doraville Business Association</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>DBA, City</td>
<td>DBA, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-27</td>
<td>Marketing materials highlighting existing businesses</td>
<td>$3k-$6k - brochures</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>DBA, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-28</td>
<td>Cross cultural marketing publication</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>DBA, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-29</td>
<td>Taste of Doraville</td>
<td>$5k - $10k</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville, DBA, Private</td>
<td>City of Doraville, DBA, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-30</td>
<td>Workforce training</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City, Higher Ed Partner, DeKalb County EDC</td>
<td>City, CDBG, SBDC, Non-profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-31</td>
<td>Georgia Foreign Trade Zone</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-32</td>
<td>Foreign Cities program</td>
<td>$1k - $5k</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-33</td>
<td>Foreign holiday commemoration</td>
<td>$200/year</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-34</td>
<td>Internet marketing program for economic development</td>
<td>$10,000/year</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, DDA/EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-35</td>
<td>City of Doraville GIS Systems</td>
<td>$25k - $150k</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, DDA/EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-36</td>
<td>Design guidelines</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-37</td>
<td>Historic signs and markers</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, GA Historical Society, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-38</td>
<td>Gateway: Shallowford Road at Buford Highway</td>
<td>$3k - $6k</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-39</td>
<td>Gateway: New Peachtree Rd at Shallowford Rd</td>
<td>$8k - $12k</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-40</td>
<td>Gateway: I-285 at Buford Highway</td>
<td>$15k - $20k</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, Private, GDOT, TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-41</td>
<td>Gateway: MARTA entrances</td>
<td>$3k - $6k</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, Private, MARTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-42</td>
<td>Police station relocation</td>
<td>$2.0 - $3.0 million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-43</td>
<td>Consolidated government center</td>
<td>$6.5 - $9.0 million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, TAD, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-44</td>
<td>Community center</td>
<td>$2.5 - $3.5 million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville/Private</td>
<td>City, TAD, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-45</td>
<td>Stormwater management plan</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-46</td>
<td>Town Square (on city-owned land)</td>
<td>$785,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, TAD, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-47</td>
<td>Flower Park reconfiguration and renovation (on city-owned land)</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>City of Doraville</td>
<td>City, TAD, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-48</td>
<td>Bubbling Creek Linear Park (via easement, no land purchase)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Chamblee</td>
<td>City, Private, 5 Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-49</td>
<td>GM Site: The Square - Total Land</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-50</td>
<td>GM Site: The Green - Total Land</td>
<td>$2,475,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-51</td>
<td>GM Site: Bubbling Creek Park (via easement, no land purchase)</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, TAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Design & Historic Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-49</td>
<td>GM Site: The Square - Total Land</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Chamblee</td>
<td>City, Private, 5 Star</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Facilities and Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-49</td>
<td>GM Site: The Green - Total Land</td>
<td>$2,475,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-50</td>
<td>GM Site: Bubbling Creek Park (via easement, no land purchase)</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, TAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LWCF: Georgia Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants
5 Star: Five Star Grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
5.2 Zoning and Land Use Changes

For the vision for the study area to become a reality it will be necessary to update City of Doraville and City of Chamblee development regulations. The changes below will allow the study area to grow in a way that fully achieves the plan’s vision and promotes a high-quality, pedestrian friendly, mixed-use environment.

Future Land Use Plan Amendments

In many communities, the first step following completion of an LCI study is updating the future land use plan to reflect the plan’s vision. Fortunately, Doraville and Chamblee’s future land use plans are consistent with the plan vision and do not require amendment.

Zoning Amendments

The most important element to achieving the future vision or the area is amending the zoning code to legalize the plan. To this end, four key zoning actions are recommended:

1. Design Guidelines. Doraville should adopt design guidelines regulating new buildings in the study area and, perhaps, citywide. Said guidelines should reflect the vision of this plan, the community aspirations reflected in it, and the differences in various parts of the city. They should also balance these with best design practices and economics. Most importantly, they should be prepared in an open manner that considers all concerns.

2. Town Center Zoning. A new free-standing zoning district should be created for the Town Center area to replace its C-2, OI, C-1, and R-3 district. Such should allow mixed-use development, incorporate pedestrian-friendly planning standards, and reflect other elements of this study.

3. Buford Highway Zoning. Concurrent with crafting Town Center zoning, a new district should also be created for the Buford Highway corridor, either as a subarea of the aforementioned code or a separate district. As with Town Center zoning, it should incorporate the recommendation of this study, paying attention to the more auto-oriented nature of Buford Highway and transitions between redevelopment and the Northwoods neighborhood.

4. GM Site Rezoning. Although it is customary to recommend the proactive rezoning of key development sites in studies like this, such is not recommended for the former GM site due to the large and complex nature of its redevelopment. Instead, once a developer is selected by GM, the City should work with them to ensure the maximum feasible compliance with the vision reflected in this plan. These elements should be conditioned to the site via the rezoning process, with special attention given to the need for flexible of use and program, within a more fixed framework of blocks, streets, and public spaces.

All of the above should incorporate elements of form-based zoning. Unlike traditional zoning districts, which regulate the built environment by describing what is prohibited, form-based codes are prescriptive in that they strive to achieve a specific built result. To this end, they are ideal tools for encouraging the type of pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use development patterns envisioned for the study area.
5.3 Population and Employment Changes

It is projected that the built-out Framework Plan will add population and jobs to the study area as identified below.

2021 Population and Employment

It is estimated that 1,819 residents currently live within the study area. The recommended land uses will increase the number of residents to 1,868 by 2016 and 2,991 by 2021. Most of these additional units are expected to be in multifamily units, which include senior housing, condominiums, and apartments.

Table 5.1: Projected Population: 2011-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Townhouses</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2016 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average New Household Size</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Population</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2021 Estimate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average New Household Size</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Units</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Population</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>2,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes the start of GM site redevelopment and removal of houses in airport noise zone

It is estimated that employment will also increase in the coming decade, as shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Projected Employment: 2011-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial/ Hotel</th>
<th>Industrial/ Warehousing</th>
<th>Office/ Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2016 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Square Footage</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Employees</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2021 Estimate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Square Footage</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Employees</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>4,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes the start of GM site redevelopment
2036 Employment and Population

Estimating employment and population growth beyond ten years is difficult on the micro-level. Real estate and economic trends are complex and subject to change. Because the recommended land use plan is based on a 25-year vision, longer-term forecasts can be made based on achieving said vision. Inherent to this is a regional return to economic growth and an assumption that some facilities will be redeveloped.

Study area growth projections are shown in Tables 5.3 through 5.6. Note that these figures are based on the general carrying capacity of the area, not a specific site. They also assume a moderate growth scenario for the redeveloped GM site; a more intensive scenario could increase these figures.

Table 5.3: Cumulative Commercial, Industrial, and Office Growth: 2011-2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial/Hotel</th>
<th>Industrial/Warehousing</th>
<th>Office/Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,980,000 sf</td>
<td>985,000 sf</td>
<td>60,000 sf</td>
<td>3,025,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,030,000 sf</td>
<td>1,010,000 sf</td>
<td>85,000 sf</td>
<td>3,125,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2,380,000 sf</td>
<td>910,000 sf</td>
<td>385,000 sf</td>
<td>3,675,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026*</td>
<td>3,000,000 sf</td>
<td>750,000 sf</td>
<td>850,000 sf</td>
<td>4,600,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031*</td>
<td>3,300,000 sf</td>
<td>600,000 sf</td>
<td>2,000,000 sf</td>
<td>5,900,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036*</td>
<td>4,000,000 sf</td>
<td>500,000 sf</td>
<td>4,500,000 sf</td>
<td>9,000,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Cumulative Employment: 2011-2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial/Hotel</th>
<th>Industrial/Warehousing</th>
<th>Office/Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026*</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>6,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031*</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>9,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036*</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>10,817</td>
<td>15,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Cumulative Total Housing Units: 2011-2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Townhouses</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Cumulative Population: 2011-2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Family Residents</th>
<th>Townhouse Residents</th>
<th>Multifamily Residents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>2,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>7,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Long-term data are supported by regional growth projections prepared by the Atlanta Regional Commission. Figures shown reflect a moderate growth scenario based on development than can be physically accommodated given the land use program.
5.5 Consistency with LCI Goals

2010 Downtown Master Plan LCI Study and the recommendations contained herein are consistent with the ten components of the LCI program as identified below:

1. Efficiency/feasibility of land uses and mix appropriate for future growth including new and/or revised land use regulations needed to complete the development program.

   The land use recommendations call for the introduction of increased employment, housing, and retail options throughout the study area. These include major corporate office facilities, large retail centers, and a range of housing options. Housing options include above-shop lofts in new mixed-use buildings, live/work units, multifamily buildings and townhouses. Single-family houses are limited, but could be incorporated into large redevelopment sites, including the former GM Assembly.

   In addition, the plan will be followed by a new zoning district to achieve the design and mixed-use land use patterns contained herein.

2. Transportation demand reduction measures.

   The plan proposes reducing auto-demand by shifting some auto trips to pedestrian and bicycle trips via a multifaceted effort to: locate different land uses within walking distance; improve pedestrian facilities; improve transit access; improve bicycle facilities; and establish land use patterns that support the improved utilization of MARTA.

3. Internal mobility requirements, including traffic calming, pedestrian circulation, transit circulation, and bicycle circulation.

   One of the central tenets of this study is to enhance connectivity for all transportation modes and balance these with the land use vision. The plan includes both public and private street connections that will provide multiple vehicular options as the area redevelops. In addition, accessibility for non-drivers is improved by building new tree-lined sidewalks along key streets, establishing sidewalks standards for new development, creating a bicycle network, enhancing existing transit, supporting future transit upgrades, and improving pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

4. Mixed-income housing, job/housing match and social issues.

   The study area currently has few quality housing options, but the plan calls for introducing new housing types (identified in item 1 above) to the study area. This includes housing for people of a variety of ages, lifestyles, and incomes. It includes policies intended to support elderly housing, along with recommendations to incorporate workforce housing, especially for teachers, police officers, fire fighters, and similar public employees. It also calls for redeveloping existing substandard housing and incorporating said units and residents into new, mixed-income projects.

   The plan also proposes increasing employment options within walking distance of existing and proposed housing. New employment areas will be focused on the redeveloped GM site and within the Doraville Town Center. These will benefit both existing nearby neighborhoods and new housing.

5. Continuity of local streets in the study area and the development of a network of minor roads.

   The plan includes a vision for creating an extensive interconnected street network as the study area builds out. These include public facilities (i.e. the proposed Buford Highway - Peachtree Boulevard Connector) as well as those provided with private redevelopment.

A central goal of this plan is maximizing use of the existing MARTA rail station and laying the foundation for future transit use. The planning process identified a strong support for existing transit initiatives, as well as the implementation of potential new ones. These include establishing light rail along I-285 and into Gwinnett County, implementing bus rapid transit on Buford Highway, enhancing the existing MARTA station to better connect to the former GM Assembly, creating transit-supportive land uses, establishing future circulator bus service, and providing new streets for future transit access.

7. Connectivity of transportation system to other centers.

The plan supports existing MARTA and roadway connections to nearby centers. It calls for improving future connections via rail transit to Perimeter Center and Norcross, a potential intercity rail stop connecting to Atlanta and points north, and the proposed Buford Highway - Peachtree Boulevard Connector, which will connect I-285 to Doraville, Chamblee, and Dunwoody.

8. Center development organization, management, promotion, and economic restructuring.

Economic development is a key element of this LCI plan. As the area grows, the plan calls for creating a major employment center and establishing a community improvement district (CID) to handle future marketing, management, and promotion efforts.

The introduction of new housing near existing and proposed commercial or mixed-use nodes will also support retailers by increasing their potential customer base.

9. Stakeholder participation and support.

The study process included extensive public involvement in the form of an online image preference survey, four community meetings, stakeholder meetings, and extensive interviews. In addition, the consultants met one-on-one with a variety of groups, including land owners, developers, senior citizen groups, and MARTA.


The plan calls for the City of Doraville and the City of Chamblee to continue their efforts to direct investment into the study area via public improvements such as pedestrian facilities, new parks, and public buildings. It also supports future public-private redevelopment through study of the creation of a tax allocation district (TAD) and community improvement district (CID).
5.5 Lifelong Communities

Many of the weaknesses identified in the analysis on pages 62 and 63 are addressed by the recommendations of this study in order to make the greater Doraville community a place where people of all ages and abilities can live. This is both a key element of the ARC’s Lifelong Communities program and a desire of greater Doraville stakeholders.

Specific examples of projects that support creating a community that is friendly to people of all ages include new sidewalks to access destinations such as downtown Doraville, MARTA, retail services, and parks; tree plantings to increase shade; transit upgrades; the possibility of a circulator shuttle; zoning changes and redevelopment concepts that increase the range of supportive housing types; the provision of more needs within walking distance of existing and future homes; enhanced community services and facilities; and access to local healthy foods through community gardens.