

**From:** [hbgroover@aol.com](mailto:hbgroover@aol.com)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Cc:** [Patti Garrett](#); [Tony Powers](#); [George Dusenbury](#)  
**Subject:** CoD Planning Commission Mtg 10-11-2022: Text amendments to Articles 2, 3, 6, 7 & 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance to allow duplex, triplex and quadplex residential units in R-50, R-60, R-85, and RS-17 single-family residential zoning districts.  
**Date:** Sunday, September 25, 2022 4:38:21 PM  
**Attachments:** [CITY of DECATUR planning COMMISSION meeting 10-11-22.pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Honorable Members,

As a 60-year resident of Garden Lane, City of Decatur, I object to the subject proposal for the following reasons:

1. Traffic and street parking are already problems here, such that portions of this street are effectively 'one way' much of the time, which creates passage and safety hazards. If the number of families is increased, then these will become major problems, and even more so once you install the sidewalk I understand is to be built in the near future which will narrow the road.
2. The City of Decatur Public Schools are already overcrowded, so increasing the number of families will exacerbate the problem and require further tax increases (including de facto tax increases such as new bond issuances) for more classrooms.
3. The character of this neighborhood is long established. The proposal would adversely affect such, and only for the whimsical and frivolous political agenda of its proponents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours,

/s/ Edwina Bryant-Groover

Property Owner, 167 Garden Lane

**From:** [Marcia Klenbort](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** My contribution to Oct 11 Planning Commission  
**Date:** Sunday, October 2, 2022 1:10:36 PM

---

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

Dear Angela and Members of the Decatur Planning Commission.

I heartily approve changing the "single-family" designation for properties in Decatur. Opening these properties to the possibility of 2 or 3 or even 4 units rather than one -- this will go a long way to increasing workplace housing and affordable housing in our city.

Thank you for listening.

Yours,

Marcia Klenbort

201 W Ponce de Leon Ave, #61

Decatur GA 30030-3268

cell: 404 520-0271

**From:** [Annie Godfrey](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Missing Middle Ordinance Comments  
**Date:** Monday, October 10, 2022 7:10:15 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,

Decatur is a wonderful city. However, over the 38 years I have lived here, the City has lost much of its economic and racial diversity. The high cost of housing is one cause of this loss. City and school employees cannot afford to live in the city they serve. Employees of shops and restaurants cannot live close to their workplaces. The missing middle housing ordinance will allow a gradual change to more diverse and inclusive housing. I live on a street with several multi-family units. It is a lovely street with fantastic neighbors. I would love to see all of Decatur look like our street. I support the missing middle housing ordinance.

Sincerely,

Annie Godfrey  
128 Garden Lane

**From:** [CHRISTINE carlton](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Please share  
**Date:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 11:06:53 PM

---

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

Ms. Threadgill,

Please share these thoughts with the planning commission prior to the October 11, 2022 meeting:

To whom it may concern in the City of Decatur Development Committee and Commissioners:

I am writing to express concerns related to the proposed complete and abrupt change in the zoning code in the residential neighborhoods within the City of Decatur.

The analysis provided to residents in the Q & A is one sided. Please take time to review all of the potential outcomes with residents prior to moving forward. It is not clear or straightforward that the proposed changes will have the desired, stated effect of providing affordable housing for people that work in Decatur. The rapid increase in density recently within the CoD has made it a less desirable place to live. It is already difficult to find the odd moment of quiet between the endless roar of landscape equipment and the long waits in traffic to get anywhere within the CoD; now imagine doubling, tripling, or quadrupling housing density— that creates a completely different environment than what most home owners in Decatur desired when they purchased their single family homes. The potential for additional building of ADUs within the city, which already has tremendous issues with stormwater, runoff, flooding, and erosion, is irresponsible.

A primary concern is with investors purchasing multiple properties and drastically changing the nature of the neighborhoods current residents and property tax payers live in. How can this be prevented? Could some degree of limitation or restriction on the number or speed of converting single family homes to multifamily units be imposed? For example, conversions could be reserved for property owners who have resided in the property for a minimum of 5 years or agree to reside at the property for a minimum of 5 years after conversion. The number of converted properties owned by a single investor could also be capped to maintain diversity and prevent any one entity from controlling the future development of our neighborhoods. This would allow for a slower conversion rate and mandate that property owners be committed investors to both maintaining what makes the City of Decatur what it is (or was when many of the current property owners bought their homes and expected to remain in single family neighborhoods) and to addressing the housing issues the city government is eager to address.

Why be concerned about commercial investors? In an early release of information by CoD the issue of commercial investors was downplayed based on data that CoD has less commercial investment than Atlanta. This disregards an overwhelming trend in the United States; “Investors bought 24% of all single-family houses sold nationwide last year, up from 15% to 16% annually going back to 2012, according to a *Stateline* analysis of data provided by CoreLogic, a California-based data analytics firm, from <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2022/07/22/investors-bought-a-quarter-of-homes-sold-last-year-driving-up-rents>

Decatur is experiencing this already. On one street there is one investor who owns multiple properties on the street. When residents were exploring options for a sidewalk on the street it became obvious that this one investor would have a greater influence in the final plan than any other homeowner, leading to a very different outcome. Likewise, the City Schools of Decatur have purchased 3 homes on Westchester Dr. The idea of converting these homes/properties into multifamily units with as many as 4 units per property has been proposed by CoD City Planner Kiristin Allin: “The third option is to subdivide the homes and make them into duplexes or triplexes. The last option was to subdivide the homes into a duplex or triplex, and add an ADU. “These could be great houses to subdivide,” Allin said.” [Decatur School Board, city of Decatur discuss future of CSD-owned homes](#) Converting these 3 neighboring properties simultaneously will have a major impact on surrounding neighbors and highlights the difficulties the CoD can anticipate when non-residents own multiple investment properties in a small area. This also highlights the problems that can be anticipated if adjustments are made to reduce required off-street parking requirements. In the Westchester Dr. example there could be 3 neighboring multifamily properties with many residents not having an off-street option for parking.



Please ensure that the future of CoD is guided by residents and not by investors.

Off-street parking requirements should be maintained. The reality is that most of the City of Decatur is not within walking distance to public transportation and residents will still need a car for getting to work, the grocery store, and other errands. On my street with 8 multifamily homes, every individual unit has a minimum on one car and many units have multiple cars.

CoD analysis of the impact these proposed changes would have on school enrollment does not match the local landscape. Renters specifically come to CoD for their children to attend CoD schools. Often multiple units of the same multifamily property have school age children. Since the property appraisal values of multifamily units often fall below that of neighboring single-family properties, the amount of property taxes raised on multifamily units often falls below neighboring properties, meaning less money per child is being brought in to pay for schools.

Please make sure the Board explores all of the potential outcomes, positive and negative, prior to moving forward with any changes. Please make slow and reversible changes so the residents can determine if these changes are having the intended effect.

Thank you,

Christine Carlton

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [ctangum@mindspring.com](mailto:ctangum@mindspring.com)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Proposal re: Missing Middle Housing Forum  
**Date:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 8:37:54 PM

---

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

Dear City of Decatur Planning Commission Members,

We are writing to share our opinion about the proposals that have emerged from the Missing Middle Housing Forum. As a Decatur resident for the past 25+ years, we value all types of diversity in our city – including socioeconomic diversity. However, we are opposed to allowing construction of and conversion to duplexes and walk-up flats in R-50, R-60, R-85, and RS-17 zoning districts. Our concerns include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The proposal will not mitigate the affordable housing problem in Decatur. While units in a multiple-resident unit are likely to rent for less than a single-family home, there is nothing in the proposal that keeps rents for such units at an affordable or below-market rate.
2. With all the recent and ongoing development of apartment buildings in Decatur, there are enough rental units already available at market rates. Although there are some drawbacks to having large apartment complexes in Decatur, at least these buildings are equipped with the parking needed for the tenants.
3. There is insufficient parking in most Decatur neighborhoods to absorb several additional cars per residential unit. It is completely unacceptable to allow so many additional cars to clog the residential streets of Decatur.
4. There is typically no stipulation that the owner of the duplexes, triplexes and quadruplexes live on the property. When “investors” purchase properties solely for the sake of renting them to others, the motive is financial gain – pure and simple. They do not contribute to the neighborhood in the same way that homeowners do when they live, play, work and/or send their children to schools in the community.
5. There are numerous examples of existing duplexes, triplexes and quadruplexes in Decatur that are poorly maintained and have high vacancy rates. Our understanding is that the negative effects of absentee ownership was one of the reasons that Decatur moved to disallow these multi-unit housing options in single-family neighborhoods back in the 1980s. There is absolutely no reason to think that anything has changed to make this less of a concern now. In fact, with the popularity of Airbnb and similar business opportunities, we should be even more concerned about an increase in absentee owners/investors.
6. To be very blunt, this proposal is clearly not about increasing affordable housing options. This proposal is about continuing to allow developers and investment-minded contractors to do whatever they like in Decatur while taking full advantage of its Planning Commission, City Commissioners and residents.

It is in the best interest of all Decatur residents to disallow the proposed zoning changes. As officials presumably dedicated to serving the good of Decatur and its residents, we encourage each of you to

oppose this change.

Thank you.

Carol and Rick Tangum  
106 Geneva Street  
(District #1)



**From:** [Caleb Kirksey](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** I support the zoning changes to make Decatur a more inclusive city  
**Date:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 4:35:08 PM

---

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

Planning & Economic Development Director Angela Threadgill,

Decatur is becoming increasingly unaffordable and exclusive. I strongly support the 2 zoning proposals that will re-allow "Missing Middle" homes in our neighborhoods. These modest proposals will allow more diverse housing types in Decatur to allow more diverse families to enjoy our amazing city. Missing middle housing has a range of benefits. It can help increase the housing supply, create more affordable housing options, promote density and walkability, and create more diverse housing options for residents.

I ask that you support these zoning changes to make Decatur the inclusive, diverse city that I know it can be.

Thank you for reading my note and your continued service to Decatur,  
Caleb Kirksey  
276 W Parkwood Rd

Caleb Kirksey  
ckirksey3@gmail.com  
276 W Parkwood Rd  
Decatur, Georgia 30030

**From:** [Tom Dempsey](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Amendments to Unified Development Ordinance  
**Date:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 1:12:50 PM

---

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

Planning Commission Members,

I am unable to participate in the upcoming meeting concerning changes to the residential zoning which will allow duplex, triplex and quadplex housing. Therefore, I would like to voice my opinion through email. I DO NOT support any changes to the current zoning system. In theory, the changes do not offend me. However, I believe the city is trying to fast track so many changes to our city through high density zoning that it will be hard for another five to ten years to determine if what we have already started is going to improve our town. The sheer volume of apartments, condominiums and townhomes going up already is enough to seriously impact the quality of life for those who consider Decatur their home. All of those changes already begun will have unforeseen consequences. They always do. I would therefore like to see a moratorium on major changes to residential zoning for at least five years to determine if and how we should move forward. Government Studies can only get us so far and I would hate to think that any negative impact could have been avoided simply by a "wait and see" attitude.

Best regards and thank you for your efforts,  
Tom Dempsey  
220 Wilton Drive

--

Tom

**From:** [dianaevansberman@aol.com](mailto:dianaevansberman@aol.com)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** I support the change to the zoning ordinance  
**Date:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 10:41:00 AM

---

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

Ms. Threadgill:

I am a resident of Decatur. I am writing in support of the amendment to city ordinances to allow duplex, triplex, and quadplex residential units in R-50, R-60, R-85, and RS-17 single-family residential zoning districts. I moved to Decatur in 1980 prior to the elimination of this ordinance. I am saddened to see an increase in the lack of diversity in our city's residents due to the lack of housing types available. I want more people of different income levels to be able to live in our city again including, but not limited to, teachers and other city employees. All the residents of Decatur would be better for that.

Sincerely,

Diana Berman  
128 Champlain Street  
Decatur, GA

**From:** [Alan McNabb](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** City of Decatur Planning Commission meeting Oct. 11th: Comment Regarding Recommendation #13  
**Date:** Saturday, October 8, 2022 5:42:33 PM

---

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

Hello Angela:

I would like to make a comment about Recommendation #13, under consideration by the City of Decatur, which would allow for new duplex, triplex, and quadplex housing in Decatur's neighborhoods.

I am on the Board of Directors of the Decatur Land Trust, a non-profit with the mission to acquire and create homes for permanent affordability and to steward new homeowners and minimize displacement. Both as a board member of Decatur Land Trust and as a homeowner in Decatur for over 30 years, I support this Recommendation and ask the City Planning Commission and the City Commissioners to move to implement this Recommendation.

To be a thriving and energetic place to live and work, the City needs more affordable housing options. This Recommendation will provide more options for homeownership, while also providing attractive investment opportunities for developers. This could also give the Decatur Land Trust more options to provide for permanent affordability in the City.

I hope the City takes this action.

Thank you,  
Alan McNabb  
14 Candler Grove Drive  
Decatur, GA 30030

**From:** [Carol Burgess](#)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Subject:** Missing Middle Housing  
**Date:** Monday, October 10, 2022 11:39:51 AM

---

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

I grew up in Decatur and in 1983 I bought the house I live in now in the Oakhurst neighborhood. I wanted to live in a neighborhood that was diverse racially and economically. Also it was a 1920's bungalow (which I love!) and it was affordable.

Over the years I have been saddened by the growing lack of diversity in my area. I support the zoning change that would allow more affordable housing in my area. We can't undo the past but we can begin to take steps to make positive changes moving forward.

Carol Burgess  
108 Evans Dr.  
Decatur, GA 30030

	John's Creek	Decatur	Georgia	USA
FIPS code	1342425	1322052	13	1
2020 Census	82,453	24,928	10,711,908	331,449,281
2010 Census	76,728	19,335	9,687,653	308,745,538
Percent change	7.5%	28.9%	10.6%	7.4%
2000 Census		18,147		
Persons <18	26.6	32.1	23.4	22.2
<18, 2000		22.9		
Home median value	\$423,600	\$547,300	\$190,200	\$229,805
	77.4%	base	34.8%	42.0%
Monthly owner costs	\$2,297	\$2,698	\$1,449	\$1,621
	85.1%	base	53.7%	60.1%
Household income	\$125,862	\$114,615	\$61,224	\$64,994
	109.8%	base	53.4%	56.7%
Land Area, 2020	30.81	4.60	57,716.96	
Land Area, 2010	30.73	4.27	57,513.49	
Percent change	0.3%	7.7%	0.4%	

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/johnscreekcitygeorgia,decaturcitygeorgia,GA,US/PST045221>

School enrollment	K-12	Increase	% Total Pop
FY2002-3	2,418	base	13.3%
FY2012-3	3,268	135.2%	16.9%
FY2022-3	5,477	226.5%	22.0%
12th Grade 2006	176		
12th Grade 2022	410		

[https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte\\_pack\\_enrollgrade.entry\\_form](https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte_pack_enrollgrade.entry_form)









































































## QuickFacts

Johns Creek city, Georgia; Decatur city, Georgia; Georgia; United States

QuickFacts provides statistics for all states and counties, and for cities and towns with a **population of 5,000 or more**.


### Table


All Topics 	Johns Creek city, Georgia	Decatur city, Georgia	Georgia	United States
Population Estimates, July 1 2021, (V2021)	 82,065	 24,569	 10,799,566	 331,893,745
 PEOPLE				
Population				
Population Estimates, July 1 2021, (V2021)	 82,065	 24,569	 10,799,566	 331,893,745
Population estimates base, April 1, 2020, (V2021)	 82,499	 24,937	 10,711,908	 331,449,281
Population, percent change - April 1, 2020 (estimates base) to July 1, 2021, (V2021)	 -0.5%	 -1.5%	 0.8%	 0.1%
Population, Census, April 1, 2020	82,453	24,928	10,711,908	331,449,281
Population, Census, April 1, 2010	76,728	19,335	9,687,653	308,745,538
Age and Sex				
Persons under 5 years, percent	 4.5%	 7.1%	 5.9%	 5.7%
Persons under 18 years, percent	 26.6%	 32.1%	 23.4%	 22.2%
Persons 65 years and over, percent	 10.5%	 11.5%	 14.7%	 16.8%
Female persons, percent	 50.9%	 53.2%	 51.2%	 50.5%
Race and Hispanic Origin				
White alone, percent	 57.8%	 70.4%	 59.4%	 75.8%
Black or African American alone, percent (a)	 10.0%	 16.1%	 33.0%	 13.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent (a)	 0.3%	 0.2%	 0.5%	 1.3%
Asian alone, percent (a)	 25.5%	 3.7%	 4.6%	 6.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent (a)	 0.0%	 0.0%	 0.1%	 0.3%
Two or More Races, percent	 4.4%	 9.2%	 2.4%	 2.9%
Hispanic or Latino, percent (b)	 7.5%	 5.9%	 10.2%	 18.9%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent	 53.3%	 68.2%	 51.0%	 59.3%
Population Characteristics				
Veterans, 2016-2020	2,840	804	625,251	17,835,456
Foreign born persons, percent, 2016-2020	31.0%	8.7%	10.2%	13.5%
Housing				
Housing units, July 1, 2021, (V2021)	X	X	4,475,274	142,153,010
Owner-occupied housing unit rate, 2016-2020	75.3%	66.9%	64.0%	64.4%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2016-2020	 \$423,600	 \$547,300	\$190,200	\$229,800
Median selected monthly owner costs -with a mortgage, 2016-2020	 \$2,297	 \$2,698	\$1,449	\$1,621
Median selected monthly owner costs -without a mortgage, 2016-2020	\$807	\$826	\$435	\$509
Median gross rent, 2016-2020	\$1,702	\$1,339	\$1,042	\$1,096
Building permits, 2021	X	X	67,223	1,736,982
Families & Living Arrangements				
Households, 2016-2020	28,748	8,876	3,830,264	122,354,219
Persons per household, 2016-2020	2.93	2.70	2.68	2.60
Living in same house 1 year ago, percent of persons age 1 year+, 2016-2020	86.5%	85.5%	85.5%	86.2%
Language other than English spoken at home, percent of persons age 5 years+, 2016-2020	36.2%	12.7%	14.0%	21.5%
Computer and Internet Use				
Households with a computer, percent, 2016-2020	98.9%	93.2%	92.0%	91.9%
Households with a broadband Internet subscription, percent, 2016-2020	97.5%	90.1%	84.4%	85.2%
Education				
High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2016-2020	96.7%	95.4%	87.9%	88.5%
Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2016-2020	68.6%	73.5%	32.2%	32.9%

Health				
With a disability, under age 65 years, percent, 2016-2020	5.0%	4.6%	8.9%	8.7%
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years, percent	⚠ 7.2%	⚠ 4.3%	⚠ 14.7%	⚠ 9.8%
Economy				
In civilian labor force, total, percent of population age 16 years+, 2016-2020	67.8%	66.5%	62.7%	63.0%
In civilian labor force, female, percent of population age 16 years+, 2016-2020	59.2%	61.4%	58.6%	58.4%
Total accommodation and food services sales, 2017 (\$1,000) (c)	132,959	117,070	26,010,075	938,237,077
Total health care and social assistance receipts/revenue, 2017 (\$1,000) (c)	419,294	169,636	68,759,707	2,527,903,275
Total transportation and warehousing receipts/revenue, 2017 (\$1,000) (c)	31,048	D	35,564,898	895,225,411
Total retail sales, 2017 (\$1,000) (c)	477,705	90,245	148,624,614	4,949,601,481
Total retail sales per capita, 2017 (c)	\$5,662	\$3,788	\$14,267	\$15,224
Transportation				
Mean travel time to work (minutes), workers age 16 years+, 2016-2020	32.6	27.3	28.7	26.9
Income & Poverty				
Median household income (in 2020 dollars), 2016-2020	\$125,862	\$114,615	\$61,224	\$64,994
Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2020 dollars), 2016-2020	\$53,582	\$56,424	\$32,427	\$35,384
Persons in poverty, percent	⚠ 4.2%	⚠ 8.3%	⚠ 14.0%	⚠ 11.6%
BUSINESSES				
Businesses				
Total employer establishments, 2020	X	X	244,668	8,000,178
Total employment, 2020	X	X	4,107,151	134,163,349
Total annual payroll, 2020 (\$1,000)	X	X	216,568,398	7,564,809,878
Total employment, percent change, 2019-2020	X	X	1.6%	0.9%
Total nonemployer establishments, 2019	X	X	1,000,184	27,104,006
All employer firms, Reference year 2017	1,966	920	171,986	5,744,643
Men-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	962	452	106,316	3,480,438
Women-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	488	288	35,855	1,134,549
Minority-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	686	122	34,980	1,014,958
Nonminority-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	1,086	679	125,364	4,371,152
Veteran-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	105	S	12,988	351,237
Nonveteran-owned employer firms, Reference year 2017	1,668	730	144,508	4,968,606
GEOGRAPHY				
Geography				
Population per square mile, 2020	2,675.9	5,422.7	185.6	93.8
Population per square mile, 2010	2,497.0	4,527.2	168.4	87.4
Land area in square miles, 2020	30.81	4.60	57,716.96	3,533,038.28
Land area in square miles, 2010	30.73	4.27	57,513.49	3,531,905.43
FIPS Code	1342425	1322052	13	1



Value Notes

 Estimates are not comparable to other geographic levels due to methodology differences that may exist between different data sources.

Some estimates presented here come from sample data, and thus have sampling errors that may render some apparent differences between geographies statistically indistinguishable. Click the Quick Info  icon to the row in TABLE view to learn about sampling error.

The vintage year (e.g., V2021) refers to the final year of the series (2020 thru 2021). Different vintage years of estimates are not comparable.

Users should exercise caution when comparing 2016-2020 ACS 5-year estimates to other ACS estimates. For more information, please visit the [2020 5-year ACS Comparison Guidance](#) page.

Fact Notes

- (a) Includes persons reporting only one race
- (c) Economic Census - Puerto Rico data are not comparable to U.S. Economic Census data
- (b) Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories

Value Flags

- Either no or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest or upper in open ended distribution.
- F Fewer than 25 firms
- D Suppressed to avoid disclosure of confidential information
- N Data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
- FN Footnote on this item in place of data
- X Not applicable
- S Suppressed; does not meet publication standards
- NA Not available
- Z Value greater than zero but less than half unit of measure shown

QuickFacts data are derived from: Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing, Current Population Survey, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits.

CONNECT WITH US

[Information Quality](#) | [Data Linkage Infrastructure](#) | [Data Protection and Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [FOIA](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [No FEAR Act](#) | [U.S. Department of Commerce](#) | [USA.gov](#)

**From:** [steve.monroe@mindspring.com](mailto:steve.monroe@mindspring.com)  
**To:** [Angela Threadgill](#)  
**Cc:** [Steve Monroe](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Mtg comments; background materials  
**Date:** Monday, October 10, 2022 2:24:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [Decatur-demographics\\_2022-10-10.pdf](#)  
[CensusBureau-QuickFacts\\_JohnsCreek\\_Decatur\\_Georgia\\_UnitedStates.pdf](#)

---

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

Angela,

I plan to make brief comments at the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow in support of the proposed amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (agenda item III.a).

I've attached some background information from the US Census Bureau and the Georgia Department of Education.

Please make this information available to the commission members.

Thank you,

Steve Monroe

152 Poplar Cir, Decatur, GA 30030

\*\*\*\*\*

Steve Monroe

[steve.monroe@mindspring.com](mailto:steve.monroe@mindspring.com)

+1-404-697-5730

\*\*\*\*\*