

Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee
June 9, 2022
Meeting 3 (Virtual)

Committee Member: Jim Collins, Tomeca McPherson, Melissa Phillips, Dwayne Stephens, Bryan Wardlaw

Absent: Monica Mastrianni, Pat Shay

Consultant Team: Bill Ross, Paige Hatley

City Staff: Bridget Lidy

Bridget Lidy explained that the meeting was being held to review the revisions to the Methodology Report based on feedback from the previous meeting held in May.

Paige Hatley stated that following the meeting, she was able to go back and review the information in the Parks and Recreation section the document. They removed “Historic Parks and Squares” in the inventory of park lands. This changed the Level of Service (LOS) for park acreage and slightly reduced the number of additional park acres “demanded” by new growth. In addition, this revision reduced the maximum impact fee that could be collected from residential development

She explained that Table 4 details the levels of service and forecast where a new line was added called “Linear Park System”. By pulling out the 30 acres associate with the Trail, we were able to connect the item to multiple uses—both residential and nonresidential. Initially the Parks and Recreation only identified residents as users of the system. Based on the discussion from the last meeting, we realized that the 30-mile citywide trail will impact uses beyond just residential. Now, all uses will be impacted to include visitors. A new subsection referred to as “Linear Park System” has been added to the Parks and Recreation chapter to outline how these uses will impacted. She added that the trail system is a total of 30 miles with 3 miles completed resulting in the 27-mile calculation.

Ms. Hatley continued by saying that the park acreage remains the same for the items identified previously. However, with the addition of the Trail System, they were able to have the service population be both day and night thereby expanding the users to both businesses and residents. Prior to this change, the only residents were captured.

Now that the trail system is included, the maximum fee is reduced by \$100 for a home. Increases are found with nonresidential users. For example, now a hotel would have a maximum fee of \$30 per room.

Not a huge change yet the subchapter was added. All uses are assessed as part of the impact fee with Parks and Recreation.

The Maximum Impact Fee Schedule was adjusted to reflect these two changes (1. removal of Historic Parks and Squares and 2. Addition of the Linear Park System).

Bryan Wardlaw asked how the per unit cost was calculated. The \$300,000 per acre in the park category seems high. Paige explained that the figure was based on looking a several sources to include the City’s

Recreation Department, reviewing past park expenditures from the Tax Assessor's Office and Zillow. Acreage is tough because the per unit cost can vary. However, in examining these three sources, the figure was \$300,000 per acre. Bryan followed up and inquired about industrial acreage which is not as high as the park acreage. Paige explained that the number is part of the past land acquisition. The parks are typically not a full acre, so it has been piecemealed to make up an acre through a comparative analysis. Note, it is 40% of the total. Another number to plug in. She stated she will go back and take a look at the number.

Tomeca McPherson asked how the affordable housing incentive would work. Bill Ross explained that jurisdictions are able to utilize two different exemptions—affordable housing and exceptional economic development.

He added that in a previous discussion, a question was asked about revising the multifamily component of the existing water and sewer tap in fees. Should it be per unit rather than the entire building? The question came up of whether to use units versus building with the water and sewer fees when it comes to affordable housing.

Mr. Ross added he is not advocating for or against the affordable housing exemption. The only community that has it adopted is Sandy Springs. They have not used it because their housing prices are extremely high. He added that the exceptional economic development is the most common. We will discuss these options at the next meeting. This language will be included in the draft ordinance. The biggest challenge is defining affordable housing.

Mr. Wardlaw asked about credits given to builders if they include a park amenity as part of their development. Mr. Ross stated that the parks must be open to all citizens for impact fee credits. The first thing is that the developer must dedicate the area as a public park to the City. The arrangement would have to be formalized in a development agreement. This is something that would also be part of the ordinance which we review at the next meeting.

Ms. Lidy mentioned that the Methodology Report will be presented to Council on June 23. The next day, the committee will be meeting—Friday, June 24, 9AM at the Adams Complex.

A revised copy of the Methodology Report will be sent out to the committee following any additional revisions based on the discussion in this meeting.