

**From:** [Sonali Saindane](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Tree Save Area at Legacy Park South Village  
**Date:** Thursday, August 4, 2022 10:05:42 PM  
**Attachments:** [image.png](#)

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Decatur, GA network. Please note the sender and maintain caution when opening external links/attachments.**



Dear Ms. Threadgill,

I understand the Planning Board is hearing a Conditional Use Permit for the affordable units at Legacy Park. It's unclear which site plan is being approved. Several maps and aerials are referenced but only one of them saves a significant number of trees along South Columbia.

The map the board should approve is the one above, stamped revised on April 1, 2022, because it outlines clearly a "Historic Tree Save Area" that needs to be part of the land use permit. No alterations should be allowed to this Tree Save Area without an amendment to the CUP, per paragraph 2, page 10 of the application.

Thanks,

Sonali Saindane  
340 Winona Drive

**From:** [Ash Miller](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Comments to Planning Commission on Village at Legacy  
**Date:** Friday, August 5, 2022 8:55:51 AM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Decatur, GA network. Please note the sender and maintain caution when opening external links/attachments.**

Dear Planning Commission,

I write in strong support of the proposed Village at Legacy of affordable housing at Legacy Park, and to request that the Conditional Use Permit make clear that the Tree Save Area is a required part of the permit that will be implemented.

I request that the Planning Commission approve the CUP with the following clarifications: 1. a clear and enforceable Tree Save Area as depicted on the site plan on PDF page 36, stamped "revised 4.1.22", and 3. no changes to the Tree Save Area are allowed without modification to the CUP under the "major modification provisions" listed on page 10, paragraph 2. In addition, as a suggestion: where the same staff person serves as Planning Commission contact and applicant, I suggest an alternate staff person as Planning Commission contact to avoid any (likely meritless) objections of potential appearance of bias by project opponents.

More explanation of both these requests is outlined below.

Decatur has a moral responsibility to do all it can on affordable housing, and this development will demonstrate a real commitment to making a difference on this critical issue.

Affordable units deserve greenery and all the benefits of trees as much as any housing, so I am grateful to see a Tree Save Area referenced in the CUP application.

However, there is a substantial ambiguity in the application with respect to tree protection that needs clarifying.

Specifically, the application states that it seeks approval of the "plans substantially similar to those submitted, attached as exhibit B," -- but exhibit B contains multiple site plans that differ with respect to trees.

Only one site plan -- screenshotted below -- contains a Tree Save Area along S. Columbia. The CUP should therefore be clear that it is an approval of the following site plan on page 36 of the submitted PDF application, the plan stamped "revised 4.1.22"



Trees are an integral part of the Legacy Park character, and should be equally important to affordable housing there. Therefore, no modification of the Tree Save Area should be allowed without revision to the CUP. Therefore, any modification to the Tree Save Area must be included in the enumerated “no major amendments” provisions in paragraph 2 on page 10 of the application. Otherwise, these affordable units are not assured the benefits of these trees.

Finally, a word about process and the *potential* appearance of bias (which may be missed by project opponents). Angela Threadgill is serving as both applicant and also recipient of public comments on behalf of the Plannin Commission on this application. While I personally know that the Planning Commission and Ms. Threadgill will act with independent judgment, and separate her role as staff to the Planning Commission and her role as the applicant, there is a *potential* appearance of impropriety here that may be inappropriately used by project opponents. It could be preferable to establish a different contact person for public comment where Ms. Threadgill is also the applicant’s representative. It would be unfortunate for a perceived procedural matter to present issues if an opponent seeks to make it a concern on a potentially controversial project.

Many thanks for your work on this important project for our City.

All best,  
Ash Miller  
128 W Benson St.