APPENDIX B:

BASELINE CONDITIONS REPORT

The Baseline Conditions Report was conducted at the beginning of the planning process to provide a review of where the city stands as a community in 2017 on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, economic development, and community facilities. It informed the priority needs and opportunities and served as a basis for discussion at community engagement activities. The report was originally published as a standalone document.
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POURSE AND CONTENT

This Baseline Conditions Report provides a high level review of existing conditions and trends in the City of Smyrna. Its primary purpose is to support and inform the update to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. By providing a baseline review of where the city stands today as a community, it allows the Smyrna community to think strategically about the opportunities and challenges it can best plan for and influence in the years ahead. Areas of focus include land use, housing, economic development, and transportation. The review also includes a look at population trends and community resources and services. The latter two areas, while not a focus of the plan update, have a defining influence on the city’s makeup and help tell the story of what sets Smyrna apart from other communities today.

ABOUT SMYRNA

Located within Cobb County, Georgia, the City of Smyrna, totaling 15.46 square miles, is centrally positioned in the Atlanta region, with the City’s southern boundary abutting the Chattahoochee River and the City of Atlanta (see Figure B-1 on page B2). The City’s northern boundary abuts the southern tip of the City of Marietta and Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), with the bulk of the city adjacent to unincorporated areas of the Cobb County, including the prominent Cumberland Community Improvement District on the northeast, home to one of Atlanta’s important employment centers and Atlanta’s Major League Baseball Team, the Atlanta Braves at SunTrust Park.
Figure B-1. Location Map

Source: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
RECENT PLANS AND STUDIES AND THEIR ROLE IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

An important dialogue covered in this Baseline Conditions Report is that the City of Smyrna and its partners have a long history of planning. By no means is the update to Smyrna’s Comprehensive Plan happening in isolation. To a large degree, it will pull together recent plans and studies completed by the City and its partners into a coherent strategy for future growth of the city by building upon planning work already completed while calibrating those plans with new input from the City’s stakeholders and community as a whole. Among the most important plans that the update directly incorporates are Smyrna’s Comprehensive Plan 2030, Smyrna’s 2014 Strategic Vision Plan, the Cobb County Consolidated Plan, the Cobb County Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and small area studies specific to the Smyrna, including the South Cobb Drive Corridor Development Study and the Spring Road Corridor Livable Centers Initiative Study.

BASELINE CONDITIONS HIGHLIGHTS

The City of Smyrna has served as leader in municipal development over the last several years. As one of the first Atlanta area suburbs to prioritize and rebuild its city core in the Market Village area, it has shown that the location and context of community investments do matter. The City has served as a model in this regard, and the result has been continued focus by the City on fostering public and private development and investments that meet needs while also creating a sense of community and enhancing day-to-day life of its residents. The City has multiple community resources including over 25 parks and recreational facilities or resources, its own fire and police departments, and a City library. Combined, these resources provide an impressive portfolio for any community.

Top to Bottom: 1) Mixed-use core at Market Village; 2) Single-family home; 3) Scenic shared use path along Village Parkway.
SMYRNA STRATEGIC VISION PLAN
Sets a strategic overarching vision, goals, and actions for the City’s next 10 years.

SMYRNA’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2030
The City’s current plan for citywide growth and development, includes the City’s Future Land Use Plan.

COBB COUNTY CONSOLIDATED PLAN (2016)
Provides a plan for addressing special housing and community development needs in Cobb County and its municipalities.

COBB COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2040 UPDATE (2015)
Countywide plan for improvements to transportation with Cobb County and its municipalities.

SOUTH COBB DRIVE CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT STUDY (2017)
Covering South Cobb Drive corridor from Concord Road to Windy Hill Road, a collaborative effort between the City and the Georgia Department of Transportation, Cobb County and Cobb LINC, study will formulate various concepts for corridor improvements.

SPRING ROAD LIVABLE CENTERS INITIATIVE (LCI) STUDY (2017)
Focusing on guiding redevelopment along Spring Road corridor from Cobb Parkway to Atlanta Road and identifying appropriate investment projects to improve the aesthetics and functionality of this corridor.

GEORGIA TECH STUDIO: SMYRNA CROSSROADS STUDY (2016)
In coordination with the Spring Road LCI, Georgia Tech developed a vision for the gateway area around SunTrust Park, including land use, transportation, and economic development.
Located just outside the I-285 perimeter, Smyrna is a community within the Atlanta region with many opportunities at its doorstep due to its quality of life and proximity to major regional job centers and the airport. The creation of mixed-use developments continues to advance Smyrna from a purely suburban development style to a hybrid community that offers the quiet, calm of suburban-style residential areas coupled with a new in-town vibe. Mixed-use centers such as Market Village, Jonquil Village, and Belmont accommodate the various ages and lifestyle preferences of people living and desiring to live here and offer places where one can live, work, and play without leaving the city limits. These characteristics of Smyrna set a strong foundation for continuing to grow the City’s economic base and attract jobs. With an estimated 35,000 jobs and a labor force of roughly 33,000 people, there indeed is an opportunity for Smyrna to continue to look for opportunities to attract new jobs that align with the skillsets of residents while providing the right mix of housing options that meet workers’ needs. The City’s centralized location and continued development interest, however, has been driving up prices of land. Although Smyrna can still be considered affordable, largely due to its diversity of products both in terms of age and structure types, the cost of homes is on the rise. This trend raises the question of whether or not many of the city residents and workers will be able to afford to stay in Smyrna over time.

The City’s transportation network is feeling the impact of a changing context as well. Although the City enjoys easy access to the important interstates of 285 and 75, getting to and from these locations from within Smyrna is getting more and more time-consuming, largely due to the suburban development style within the city, which affords minimum alternate routes to local residents, but also due to the increasing development intensity both within Smyrna and in adjacent and nearby communities. Thru-traffic generated by residents of communities to the north and west traveling though Smyrna to interstates, regional employment centers, Downtown Atlanta, and the airport has a significant impact on congestion. The City has been working to enhance mobility through targeted transportation studies and incorporation of sidewalks and expansion of multi-use paths, but there are still few time-competitive options to driving. New transit opportunities may very well be an important key to Smyrna’s future success.

As the Comprehensive Plan charts out desired growth and development for the next 20 years, there are a variety of potential opportunities and challenges. Those presented above are just the tip of the iceberg. Building on recent successes and mitigating potential roadblocks will be essential to the City’s future success. Thoughtful planning along with an eye on implementable actions and achievable results will help Smyrna continue to build on its history as a model city within the Atlanta region.
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Smyrna’s demographic characteristics and performance have been benchmarked against five “peer” and “aspiration” cities – Cedar Park, TX; Duluth, GA; Marietta, GA; Matthews, NC; and Woodstock, GA – along with Cobb County, the Atlanta MSA, Georgia, and the United States. Three of the cities – Cedar Park, TX; Marietta, GA; and Matthews, NC – were included as an update to the 2014 Strategic Vision Plan and were selected based on their similarities to Smyrna in population size, location within a large metro area, demographics, and other indicators that put into perspective Smyrna’s performance as a city over the past decade. Duluth, GA and Woodstock, GA were added to the analysis in order to provide greater context for the dynamics observed in Smyrna, particularly with respect to its position in the Atlanta MSA.

The Atlanta MSA refers to the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, Georgia Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the February 2013 Office of Management and Budget Bulletin, which consists of 29 counties: Barrow, Bartow, Butts, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, Dawson, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Haralson, Heard, Henry, Jasper, Lamar, Meriwether, Morgan, Newton, Paulding, Pickens, Pike, Rockdale, Spalding, and Walton.

*For basic population data, the U.S. Census Bureau Population Estimates program was used. For 2000 to 2009 data, the 2010 Intercensal Dataset from the Census was utilized. For 2010 to 2015 data, the Vintage 2015 Population Estimates was utilized. For detailed data, the American Community Survey (ACS) was the primary source. Due to the size of the city, ACS estimates are five-year averages. For the most recent data available, the 2011-2015 American Community Survey was used, and for historical estimates, the 2006-2010 American Community Survey data was used.
POPULATION GROWTH

Over the past decade, Smyrna has experienced steady population growth, and as of 2015, the most recent year for which data is available, the city’s population reached 56,146. Between 2005 and 2015, the population increased by 18 percent, while over the past five years, it increased by 9.3 percent. Smyrna’s population growth closely mirrored that of the Atlanta MSA’s total population growth; however, Smyrna’s population grew at a faster rate than Georgia, Cobb County, and the neighboring city of Marietta.

Elsewhere in metro Atlanta, the City of Duluth grew at relatively the same pace as the Atlanta MSA over the past five years (9.4 percent compared to 9.3 percent), while Woodstock has grown exponentially over the past decade. Woodstock, Georgia and Cedar Park, Texas have grown at unusually fast rates and are among the country’s fastest-growing suburbs, which has partially been attributed to their proximity to fast growing metros, of Atlanta and Austin, respectively, and their positions as upcoming suburbs with new, desirable developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B-1. Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Population Estimates
RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Diversity plays an important role in defining the character of a community, and typical of many metropolitan Atlanta communities, Smyrna is much more diverse than the majority of communities across the country. This diversity is measured in two ways, race and ethnicity. Racial diversity refers to biological or genetic traits and differences among the population, such as White, Black or Asian; whereas ethnic diversity refers to cultural differences among the population such as Hispanic, Chinese, or Irish. The U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS) reports both measurements separate and together to get a composite picture of diversity in a community. In terms of ethnic diversity the ACS simplifies the categories into two major categories Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino.

Figure B-2. Racial Diversity

RACE

The ACS 2015 Estimates show Smyrna’s population at 52 percent White, 32 percent Black or African American, 8 percent Asian, and 8 percent some other race. This is a slight change from 2010 when the city population was 56 percent White, 30 percent Black or African American, 6 percent Asian, and 8 percent some other race, indicating a slight proportionally increase in the number of Blacks and Asians in the City compared with whites and other racial groups. Compared to the other benchmark communities, Smyrna has the highest percentage of non-white population, other than Duluth, which is estimated to be only 53 percent non-white.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
ETHNICITY

In terms of ethnicity, regardless of race, 14 percent of the city’s population is Hispanic or Latino. This too is a slight change from 2010, when the city population was 13 percent Hispanic or Latino, and is fairly comparable to the other benchmark communities, though marginally above the average. Among the Smyrna Hispanic community, 66 percent are Mexican, 12 percent are Puerto Rican, 2 percent are Cuban, and 22 percent are some other Hispanic or Latino culture.

DIVERSITY

Smyrna’s demographic composition is similar to the 29-county Atlanta MSA, including Duluth and Marietta; however, the city is more diverse than Cobb County as a whole and much more diverse than what is seen in the other comparison communities, including Woodstock in the Atlanta MSA.

Smyrna has continued to diversify over the past five years and has done so at a faster pace than many of the comparison communities. The increasing diversity within city limits illustrates the community’s attractiveness as a place to live for residents of many races and ethnicities. The share of the population that is Black, non-Hispanic increased by 1.8 percentage points, while Asian, non-Hispanic increased by 1.6 percentage points and the Hispanic population increased by one percentage point. Meanwhile, the share of the population that is White, non-Hispanic fell from 49.9 percent to 45.1 percent over the five-year period. The shift in the distribution was due to both growth in the minority population and a small decline (-3.2 percent) in the White, non-Hispanic population over the time period.
HOUSEHOLD SIZE

There are approximately 23,700 households in Smyrna with an average of 2.27 persons per household, a slightly smaller average household size than the county, metro, state, and nation. The number of households in Smyrna increased by 3.3 percent over the five-year period with an additional 752 households in the city. Consistent with the relatively smaller average household size, the share of households with children living in them is also smaller than what is observed at the regional level. Roughly 28 percent of households have one or more people under the age of 18. Although the average household size and share of households with children trails all the benchmark and comparison communities, it has been increasing in recent years.

Table B-2. Household Dynamics and 5-Year Change Educational Attainment Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. HH size</th>
<th>5-yr Chg.</th>
<th>% of HHs w/children</th>
<th>5-yr Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna, GA</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park, TX</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta, GA</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, NC</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock, GA</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates
**AGE DISTRIBUTION**

Smyrna has a relatively young population with nearly 70 percent of residents under the age of 45 and has one of the highest shares of residents between the ages of 25 and 44 relative to the comparison communities. Nearly 40 percent of residents fall within this age group. Residents between the ages of 25 and 44 represent individuals that are prime working age, as well as the coveted group of young professionals. Young professionals include individuals that are typically at the beginning of their careers, starting their families, and setting down roots in communities.

Approximately 22.5 percent of residents are under the age of 18, the smallest percentage of all of the comparison and regional communities; however, in recent years, the percentage of children living in Smyrna has been growing. Between 2010 and 2015, the share of residents under the age of 18 grew by 1.5 percentage points. These population trends, coupled with the household dynamics, indicate that the increase in household formations includes many households that have children residing in their homes and/or existing residents adding children in their households.

At the other end of the age spectrum, the share of the population over the age of 65 living in Smyrna increased by 1.4 percentage points between 2010 and 2015. The aging population and growth in the share of the population over the age of 65 mirrors trends seen across the country. As of 2015, 8.7 percent of Smyrna residents were aged 65 and older; with the exception of Cedar Park, Smyrna had the lowest share of residents within this age group with comparable communities.

**Figure B-4. Age Distribution**

![Age Distribution Graph]

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Smyrna boasts an extremely well-educated population, and out of the comparison communities, Smyrna had the highest share of college-educated residents. Over half of residents aged 25 and older have a bachelor’s degree or higher. In comparison, 44.1 percent of Cobb County residents and 35.8 of Atlanta MSA residents have attained a bachelor’s degree or higher. Across the state and nation, less than 30 percent of adults have attained that level of education.

Smyrna continues to attract and retain educated residents, as is evident by the increase in the share of the population that is college educated. Between 2010 and 2015, the share of residents with a bachelor’s degree or higher increased by 2.6 percentage points. This increase stemmed from a growth in the share of residents with a graduate or professional degree.

Smyrna has a smaller percentage of adults without a high school diploma than Marietta, the Atlanta MSA, Georgia, and the United States. However, when compared to the other highly educated communities such as Cedar Park, Matthews, and Cobb County, Smyrna’s share of adults without a high school diploma (9.5 percent) stands elevated in comparison. The share of Smyrna residents without a high school diploma has remained relatively unchanged.

When race and ethnicity are taken into account, disparities among Smyrna’s black and Hispanic residents are clear. While 60.7 percent of white, not Hispanic residents aged 25 or older hold a Bachelor’s degree or higher, only 42.7 percent of black residents and 20.8 percent of Hispanic residents have at least a four-year degree. However, 69.4 percent of Asian residents have at least an undergraduate degree. These disparities are common nationwide—33.2 percent of white, not Hispanic U.S. adults aged 25 or older hold a Bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 19.5 percent of black adults, 14.3 percent of Hispanic adults, and 51.4 percent of Asian adults. Smyrna is still comparatively competitive, with its proportion of white, not Hispanic and Asian residents holding a four-year degree or higher surpassing that of all nine comparison geographies. Smyrna’s proportion of black residents with a four-year degree or higher surpasses that of all geographies except Woodstock (49.3 percent) and Matthews (48.7 percent).

Smyrna’s proportion of Hispanic residents with a four-year degree surpasses that of all comparison geographies except Woodstock (32.9 percent), Matthews (34.8 percent), and Cedar Park (30.2 percent).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No HS Diploma</th>
<th>High School Diploma</th>
<th>Some college, no degree</th>
<th>Associate’s degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>Graduate or professional degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna, GA</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park, TX</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta, GA</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, NC</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock, GA</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates
**Figure B-5. Educational Attainment**

![Educational Attainment Chart](chart1.png)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates

**Figure B-6. Educational Attainment by Race and Ethnicity, Smyrna Only**

![Educational Attainment by Race and Ethnicity Chart](chart2.png)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates

Note: Black and Asian include both Hispanic and non-Hispanic. Data is not available by ethnicity for these race groups.
HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Given the high levels of educational attainment and share of residents with a bachelor’s degree or higher, it’s not surprising to see that Smyrna also has a population with relatively high household incomes. In 2015, the median household income was $62,363, which was higher than Duluth, Marietta, the Atlanta MSA, Georgia, and the United States. However, despite comparatively higher educational levels than the other benchmark communities, Smyrna’s median household income trailed Cobb County, Woodstock, Matthews, and Cedar Park.

Overall, the median household income in Smyrna increased by 14.2 percent, which was greater than all the comparable community household income growth, with the exception of Cedar Park. An analysis of the household income distribution and growth within the higher income brackets illustrates that wealth within the community has been growing in recent years. The most recent data show that the share of households earning more than $100,000 a year accounted for roughly 30.6 percent of all households in Smyrna, while nationally, 23.5 percent of households fall within that income bracket. In 2015, the share of households with incomes greater than $100,000 had increased by 4.7 percentage points in Smyrna over the five-year time frame; nationally, it increased by 2.6 percentage points. Additionally, contrary to regional trends, the share of households with an annual income of less than $25,000 did not increase in Smyrna. Duluth, Marietta, Woodstock, Cobb County, the Atlanta MSA, and Georgia all experienced an increase to some degree in the share of their population at the lowest end of the income spectrum.

It is interesting to note the range of median household income across majority and minority racial and ethnic groups. In Smyrna, the median income of white, not Hispanic households is $73,640, compared to $85,051 for Asian households, $50,893 for black households, and $37,176 for Hispanic households. Smyrna’s Asian households have a higher median income than all geographies except Cedar Park ($118,947). Cedar Park and Matthews surpass Smyrna’s median income across all selected racial and ethnic groups. While white, not Hispanic and black households in Smyrna have higher median incomes than the metro, state, and nation, this is not the case for Hispanic households, for whom incomes lag behind these geographies.
**Figure B-7. Household Income Distribution**

![Household Income Distribution Diagram](image)

**Table B-4. Household Income Distribution, 5-Year Percentage Point Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Less than $25,000</th>
<th>$25,000 to $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 to $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 to $99,999</th>
<th>$100,000 to $150,000</th>
<th>$150,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna, GA</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park, TX</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta, GA</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, NC</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock, GA</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates
POVERTY RATE

Examining poverty rates helps to gauge a community or region’s socioeconomic conditions. Poverty rates are estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau using income measures from annual population surveys. Information including family size, pre-tax income, and the number of children help the Bureau determine poverty thresholds. If a family’s income is less than the poverty threshold, that family would be considered living in poverty.

The federal poverty threshold in 2016, the most recent year for which poverty data thresholds have been set at the time of this report, for a family of four with two children was $24,339. Considering that the national median annual income for high school dropouts is $25,636, it is clear that a high school dropout is unfortunately a likely path to poverty in the United States. In this section, the total poverty rate (the percentage of all residents who are living below the poverty line) and the youth poverty rate (the percentage of residents aged 17 and below who are living below the poverty line) are examined.

In 2015, the poverty threshold for a family of four was $24,036. Smyrna’s most recent total poverty rate was 13.4 percent, while the youth’s poverty rate was 21.8 percent. Smyrna’s poverty rate is slightly higher than Cobb County (12.4%, 17.4%), but is less than the Atlanta MSA (15.6%, 22.3%), Georgia (18.4%, 26.0%), and the United States (15.5%, 21.7%). Smyrna’s poverty rate illustrates that although there is a smaller share of households in the lowest income bracket, there are still many residents living in poverty, including roughly one in five children. Youth poverty rates are historically higher than total poverty rates for several reasons, including that households with children require more income to stay out of poverty. Another contributing factor is that on average, households with children have fewer workers than childless households, i.e. two-parent households with a parent who stays at home to care for children or an elderly family member and single parent households.

Over the past decade, poverty rates across the country increased as the negative impact of the recession hit households. And although Smyrna’s poverty rates increased by less than national trends, the city was not fully immune to such negative recessionary effects. In 2015, Smyrna’s poverty rate was 0.6 percentage points higher than in 2010, and its youth poverty rate was 2.3 percentage points higher.
**Figure B-8. Poverty Rates**

![Bar chart showing poverty rates by location, with bars indicating total poverty and youth poverty.](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates

**Figure B-9. Poverty Rates by Race and Ethnicity**

![Bar chart showing poverty rates by race and ethnicity, with bars indicating total poverty and youth poverty.](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-yr Estimates
COMMUTE PROFILE

Although the Metro Atlanta area is notorious for its challenges associated with traffic and rush hour congestion on the interstate, Smyrna is one of the few cities outside the perimeter that enjoys relatively shorter commute times due to its proximity to downtown Atlanta, the airport, and major employment centers. Data show that 94.3 percent of residents are employed outside of Smyrna for their primary job, suggesting that many residents are in fact taking advantage of Smyrna’s location to major nearby employment centers. In 2014, roughly half of residents were within 10 miles of their place of employment. Overall, approximately 25 percent of residents commute to the city of Atlanta for their primary job.

Figure B-10. Jobs by Distance and Direction of Travel
Figure B-11. Inflow and Outflow of Workers, 2014

Source: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission; Census OntheMap
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK

The average travel time to work for Smyrna residents was 28.7 minutes in 2015. Smyrna’s short mean travel time to work illustrates that the average Smyrna resident is spending less time commuting than the average Atlanta resident. In comparison, Duluth (29.5), Woodstock (33.6), Cobb County (30.4), and the Atlanta MSA (30.7) all reported longer average commute times. In recent years, the average commute time for Smyrna residents increased by 3.3 minutes, a greater increase than any of the comparison communities.

An analysis of the travel time distribution of residents shows that this was most likely influenced by the increase in the share of residents with a commute time of more than 60 minutes. Between 2010 and 2015, there was a 4.3 percent increase in residents with a travel time of 60 minutes or more. Only Woodstock, Georgia experienced a greater increase in the share of residents that had a travel time of greater than one hour to work; its share of workers increased by 6.1 percent.

Figure B-12. Travel Time to Work, 2011-2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
TRANSPORTATION MODES

Similar to most communities, the average Smyrna resident’s primary means of transportation to work is in a vehicle and driving alone. In 2015, an estimated 81.4 percent of Smyrna residents drove alone, while 76.4 percent of workers in the United States also drove alone. Only 1.1 percent of Smyrna residents use public transportation as their primary mode of travel to work. In the Atlanta MSA, roughly 3 percent of residents use public transportation to travel to work.

Interestingly, Smyrna has the highest share of residents that work at home out of all the comparison communities. The most recent data show that 7.6 percent of workers over the age of 16 worked at home in Smyrna. Nationally, 4.4 percent of individuals work from home. Nearly every comparison community saw an increase in their share of residents that worked from home, as more companies embrace flexible hours and working arrangements for employees. The share of workers that work from home increased by 2.1 percent in Smyrna between 2010 and 2015.

Figure B-13. Mode of Commute, 2011-2015

[Chart showing mode of commute with percentages for Drove alone, Carpoled, Public transportation (excluding taxicab), Other, and Worked at home for Smyrna GA, Cedar Park, TX, Duluth, GA, Marietta, GA, Matthews, NC, Woodstock, GA, Cobb County, GA, Atlanta MSA, Georgia, and United States.]

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
INTRODUCTION

Much of the character, success, and productivity of a community are tied to how it uses its land. This portion of the baseline assessment systematically reviews existing land use within the City of Smyrna, by analyzing how land is used today, reporting on what plans are underway, and what regulations and policies are in place to change how the land can be used in the future.

In many ways, land use drives the other topic areas addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. The reason for this is that land use management is a primary responsibility of local government. Unlike other topic areas, such as economic development, transportation, and housing (which are primarily influenced and driven by the decisions of businesses, developers, and other government agencies), local land use decisions are the responsibility of the City of Smyrna. The Comprehensive Plan lays out the framework for making land use decisions, and this assessment identifies potential opportunities and issues that will need to be addressed in order to meet the future needs of the community. This provides a foundation upon which the community can identify potential adjustments to its Future Land Use Map, land use policy, and related priorities and initiatives that the City may choose to pursue.

ANALYSIS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Smyrna currently encompasses approximately 15.5 square miles, and over 19,200 parcels of land. In order to gain a clear understanding of current land use patterns, each of these parcels was classified by how it is being used in January 2017. This existing land use survey was based on data from Comprehensive Plan 2030, development permit records, recent tax records, aerial photography, and a windshield survey. The land use classifications are the same as those in Comprehensive Plan 2030 as described in Table B-5 on page B25.

Based on this survey, a majority of the land (approximately 64 percent) can be classified as residential, nearly two-thirds of which is single-family residential. Slightly less than 17 percent of the city can be classified as employment based or commercial and industrial. Approximately 13 percent is support based, used for Transportation/Communications/Utilities, Public/Institutional, and Parks/Recreation/Conservation. Only about 5 percent of the city is still vacant or undeveloped, indicating that most or the new construction in the city will be in the form of redevelopment. Most of this undeveloped land is located close to streams and waterways, and likely has environmental constraints for development.
The parcels classified as vacant are based on a commercial database the City’s economic development team has used over the last several years to track available commercial and industrial space within the City. Only those commercial and industrial buildings that are 100 percent vacant are classified on the Existing Land Use Map as vacant, totaling approximately 17 acres. According to the database, only 5 percent of the City’s total office and industrial space is vacant, which equates to 523,549 sq.ft. of the total supply of 3,684,567 sq. ft. This indicates a strong real estate market, and a high demand for employment based land uses in Smyrna.¹

Residential uses occupy a majority of the land area within the city. These residential areas are comprised of a large variety of neighborhoods/subdivisions, each with their own character and unified by strong neighborhood or community organizations. According to the City records, there are over 360 neighborhoods/subdivisions in the City. One of Smyrna’s greatest assets is its location within Cobb County and proximity and access to the interstate highway system and the airport. Surrounding Smyrna are several key developments that influence or will influence land use within the city including Dobbins Air Force Base, the Cumberland Mall area, and the new Atlanta Braves Major League Baseball Stadium at SunTrust Field. As a result, opportunities for greenfield development through annexation are few, and surrounding uses are likely to be future catalysts for redevelopment.

¹ City of Smyrna Commercial and Industrial Space Database
### Table B-5. Land Use Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Density Residential:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached housing with a density under 3 units per acre.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate Density Residential:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached housing with a density range between 3 and 4.5 units per acre.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Density Residential:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached and attached housing with a density range between 4.5 and 6 units per acre.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Density Residential:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached, single-family attached, and multifamily attached housing units with a density of 6 units per acre and higher.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-5. Land Use Classifications (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial:</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Commercial Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dedicated to non-industrial business uses, including retail sales, office, services and entertainment facilities. Commercial uses may be located as a single use in one building or grouped together in a shopping center or office building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mixed Use:**          | ![Mixed Use Photos](image2) |
| Land developed with an integrated combination of residential, commercial, and office uses. Frequently, mixed-use developments include ground-floor retail, services, and office uses with residential uses on upper floors (vertical mixed use). They can also include a combination of uses on separate, adjacent parcels (horizontal mixed use). |

| **Office / Professional:** | ![Office/Professional Photos](image3) |
| Office buildings and professional employment centers. |

| **Industrial:**         | ![Industrial Photo](image4) |
| Land dedicated to light manufacturing facilities, processing plants, factories, warehousing and wholesale trade facilities, assembly facilities, or other similar uses. |
### Land Use Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Communication/Utilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dedicated to such uses as power generation plants, railroad facilities, radio towers, public transit stations, telephone switching stations, or other similar uses. Road and railroad rights of way are also included in this category. For the purposes of this analysis, road and rail right-of-way has been broken out as a separate listing from the remaining T/C/U uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Institutional:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land used by state, federal or local government, or institutions. Government uses include city hall and government building complexes, police and fire stations, libraries, prisons, post offices, schools, military installations, etc. Examples of institutional land uses include colleges, churches, cemeteries, hospitals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks/Recreation/Conservation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dedicated to active or passive recreational uses. These areas may be either publicly or privately owned and may include playgrounds, public parks, nature preserves, wildlife management areas, open space, sensitive habitat, national forests, golf courses, recreation centers and other similar uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undeveloped:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This category is for lots or tracts of land that have not been developed for a specific use (left in their natural state), though they may be served by typical urban public services (water, sewer, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This category is for lots or tracts of land that are served by typical urban public services (water, sewer, etc.), were developed for a specific use, but have since been vacated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-15. Existing Land Use Map

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
KEY OBSERVATIONS:

- The City is mostly built out with only 5 percent of the land being undeveloped. Opportunities for new development will likely take the form of redevelopment of older commercial areas, and infill housing within residential areas. This topic is discussed further under the Analysis of Recent Development Trends.

- Over half the city is used for residential, offering a wide mix of housing types, though single family subdivisions are the dominant residential form.

- Most of the land surrounding the city is also built out, so opportunities for annexation and corresponding greenfield development are few. However, several key activity centers such as Dobbins Airforce Base, SunTrust Park, and Cumberland Mall serve as a strong catalyst for development interest in Smyrna.

ANALYSIS OF EXISTING ZONING, INCLUDING FOCUS ON OVERLAY DISTRICTS

The City’s zoning regulations, design guidelines, and development requirements play a dominant role in shaping the city’s natural and built environment as defined by the city’s formal land use policy. The City has a conventional zoning ordinance that for the most part separates traditionally incompatible land uses, such as industrial and residential use. In addition, the City does have a Planned Unit Development District (PUD) and a Residential Attached/detached District (RAD) that allows for a mixture of housing types within the control of an approved master plan. It also has a mixed use district that promotes a mix of compatible uses in a more urban setting.

The city has seven overlay districts including six urban design districts that follow along the major commercial corridors of the city and the downtown area, as reflected in Figure B-17 on page B31 and one Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD).

The ROD is a targeted overlay district that maybe overlaid upon the RM-12, RHR, CBD and GC zoning districts and either community activity center, high density residential or mixed-use land use categories as designated on the Future Development Map at the applicant request, and City Council approval. It is intended to provide locations for mixed use development and redevelopment of commercial, office and residential uses which are pedestrian oriented and developed at a community or regional activity center scale and intensity. Table B-6 on page B32 summarizes the prominence of each of these districts within the city.
Figure B-16. Zoning Overlay Map

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
Figure B-17. Zoning Map

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
Table B-6. Zoning Area Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category</th>
<th>Total Square Miles*</th>
<th>Percent Total Area*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-15</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC-8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-30</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Smyrna

* The total land area of the City of Smyrna is 15.46 square miles. The City’s zoning data does not assign zoning to rights-of-way and easements. Percentages shown represent the proportion of zoned land.

Table B-7. Zoning Descriptions - Design Overlays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Design District</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDD-1</td>
<td>Downtown Design District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-1</td>
<td>South Atlanta Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-2</td>
<td>Spring Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-3</td>
<td>Windy Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-4</td>
<td>South Cobb Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-5</td>
<td>Concord Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-8. Zoning Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-30</td>
<td>Single-family residential, 30,000 square feet, maximum 1.3 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>Single-family residential, 20,000 square feet, maximum 2 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-15</td>
<td>Single-family residential, 15,000 square feet, maximum 2.7 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-12</td>
<td>Single-family residential, 12,000 square feet, maximum 3.4 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Residential attached and/or detached, maximum 6 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC-8</td>
<td>Multi-family residential condominium ownership, maximum 8 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-10</td>
<td>Multi-family residential, maximum 10 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-12</td>
<td>Multi-family residential, maximum 12 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Multi-family residential, maximum 2 units per 12,500-square-foot lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-4</td>
<td>Multi-family residential, maximum 4 units per 17,000-square-foot lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Multi-family residential, maximum 10 units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-15</td>
<td>Redevelopment district - Multi-family residential, maximum 15 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Residential high-rise, maximum 12 dwelling units per acre, or as provided in article X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Future Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Limited Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Office-Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Neighborhood Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Office-Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Tourist Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Redevelopment Overlay District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBSERVATIONS:

- The existing land use and zoning maps are very similar, indicating that there are few deviations from the policies established in the previous Comprehensive Plan for the city.

- The urban design districts could be simplified and reorganized to be more uniform to ease use of the code for both city staff and the community, such as improved district boundary descriptions to remove overlaps.

- Two residential zoning categories (R-15 and RAD), combined, cover almost 50 percent of the city:

- The R-15 zoning district allows for single-family detached homes on lots with a minimum lot size of 15,000 sq. ft. at a density of 2.7 units per acre. The R-15 zoning comprises 28 percent of the City’s total land area (32.8 percent of zoned land area). The RAD zoning district allows for single-family detached or attached homes at a density of 6 units per acre. The RAD zoning comprises 18 percent of the City’s total land area (21.2 percent of zoned land area).

- R-15 is comprised mainly of well-established single-family neighborhoods, whereas RAD is a zoning designation of choice for many new residential infill developments, allowing for a range of attached and detached housing products.

- Because the two zoning classifications are so prevalent, they often abut one another, and there has been some concern voiced from staff and stakeholders in previous planning efforts regarding the need for appropriate buffers and setbacks to preserve the low density character of the traditional single-family neighborhoods.
ANALYSIS OF RECENT DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

Images on the following page highlight recent and ongoing developments in and around Smyrna, as well as those areas that have development or redevelopment potential. Noted developments in recent years include:

- **Smyrna Grove** – A 194 single-family home subdivision at the intersection of Windy Hill Road and Old Concord Road.

- **Jonquil** – A mixed-use development at the intersection of Atlanta Road and Spring Road, that includes 266 multi-family units, a 46,000 sq. ft. grocery store, and 21,400 sq. ft. of retail space in three multi-tenant buildings.

- **Belmont** – A mixed-use development at the intersection of Atlanta Road and Windy Hill Road, that includes 274 multi-family units, 154 single-family homes, 164 independent senior housing units (proposed), 28,000 sq. ft. of retail space, and a 30,000 sq. ft. medical office building.

- **Concord Road Linear Park** – A new 6-acre city park along the north side of Concord Road at the intersection with Hollis Street, and an additional 1.5 acres of retail-office and restaurant parcels.

- **Riverview Landing** – An 83-acre mixed-use development proposed along the Chattahoochee River on an old industrial site along Riverview Road, which will include 65 single-family detached homes, 233 townhomes, 310 multi-family units and 3,000 sq. ft. of retail space.

- **The Battery Atlanta** – A mixed-use development located just outside the City at the intersection of I-285 and I-75 that will be anchored by the new Atlanta Braves Baseball Stadium, SunTrust Park. The Battery Atlanta will include 630,000 sq. ft. of office, 500,000 sq. ft. of retail space, 450,000 sq. ft. of hotel space, 750,000 sq. ft. of multi-family space, and 100,000 sq. ft. of multi-use space.
Clockwise from Top Left: 1) Single family homes at Smyrna Grove; 2) Commercial buildings under construction at the mixed-use Jonquil Village development; 3) Concord Road Linear Park; 4) Rendering of The Battery Atlanta, anchored by the new Atlanta Braves Stadium, SunTrust Park; 5) Rendering of waterfront property at the proposed Riverview Landing development; 6) Smyrna Elementary School and multi-family housing at the mixed-use Belmont development.

Source: City of Smyrna Community Development Department, 2016
The Smyrna Strategic Vision Plan identifies that the City has been fortunate to experience relatively even growth over the past ten years, while overall growth in Metro Atlanta has slowed down in many areas. This clearly points to the desirability of Smyrna as a unique destination and preferred location for investment. As stated under the “Analysis of Existing Conditions,” most of this investment will be in the form of redevelopment, and the Development Trends/Opportunity Map points out the location of vacant commercial and industrial tracts where this is likely to occur.

In addition, the City has also witnessed a great deal of infill residential development, where houses in older neighborhoods are being significantly renovated or torn down and replaced. In some incidences, the original residential lot is being subdivided as well, thus increasing the existing housing density in the neighborhoods. Based on field observations, infill residential is particularly prevalent in the northern portions of the city near the Market Village.

**KEY OBSERVATIONS:**

- Development interest in Smyrna is relatively high as witnessed by several ongoing and proposed developments.
- Most of the market interest is in large mixed-used development and infill housing.

**REVIEW OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT MAP**

Adopted in 2007 as part of the City of Smyrna Comprehensive Plan 2030, Smyrna's current Future Land Use Map (FLUM), referred to as the Future Development Map, and supportive narrative provides a vision for development patterns and land use throughout the City's in terms of distinct development areas. Each development area lists recommended land uses that would be compatible with the area's vision and intent, as well as a review of the state’s Quality Community Objectives and recommended implementation measures which can be applied to achieve the desired vision for each area. This map is used primarily for guidance in making rezoning decisions.

Compared to other future development or future land use maps, around the State, the Smyrna Future Development Map is very prescriptive and describes the development areas in terms of primary land use at the parcel level, very similar to a zoning map.

The vision and intent of each of the existing 13 development areas is summarized on the following pages. The Future Development Map also denotes potential annexation areas, but it did not offer any guidance as to the future character or vision of those areas. Since the plan's adoption, several of those areas have been annexed and were subsequently reclassified using the adopted palette of 13 development areas as prescribed under the land use guidelines in the City's Service Delivery Strategy (SDS) with Cobb County. The SDS spells out what City land use designations would be acceptable to the County if the parcels were to be annexed. A corresponding City future development category is assigned for each County category. Figure B-19 on page B39 shows the recommended designations for nearby unincorporated parcels.

The appropriate land uses, implementation measures, and boundaries of the areas on the Future Development Map will be reviewed, validated, and possibly revised as part of this comprehensive planning effort.
Figure B-18. Future Development Map (Comprehensive Plan 2030)

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
Cobb County parcels are shown as the recommended City Future Development category associated with their current County FLU category, based on the Service Delivery Agreement between the City and County.

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission; City of Smyrna and Cobb County Service Delivery Strategy Agreement

Note: Cobb County parcels are shown as the recommended City Future Development category associated with their current County FLU category, based on the Service Delivery Strategy Agreement.
SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL (LESS THAN 3 UNITS/ACRE)

Comprised almost exclusively of single-family residential neighborhoods, Suburban Residential is the largest development area on the Future Development Map, representing over 44 percent of the total land area. The vision is one of preservation and enhancement: preservation from commercial encroachment, incompatible uses and traffic, and enhancement through support of public services, recreational and small scale institutional uses.

Suburban Residential neighborhoods are often characterized by cul-de-sacs and curvilinear street patterns designed to discourage cut-through traffic.

MODERATE DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (UNDER 4.5 UNITS/ACRE)

Moderate Density Residential neighborhoods primarily consist of single-family detached housing at a slightly higher density than Suburban Residential neighborhoods. The development area is characterized by a high level of pedestrian orientation and traditional neighborhood development (TND) principles. TND principles include a gridded street network, houses oriented towards the street with relatively small setbacks. Because of its pedestrian oriented design, Moderate Density Residential development is supportive of “Main Street” retail opportunities and Neighborhood Activity Centers. It is encouraged within one half mile of the Smyrna Market Village, and also serves as a transition area between established Suburban Residential neighborhoods and Neighborhood Activity Centers.

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (UNDER 6 UNITS/ACRE)

Medium Density Residential areas provide for both small attached and detached housing at a greater density than both Suburban and Moderate Density Residential neighborhoods. Medium Density Residential neighborhoods may include a mixture of owner and renter occupied housing, and also provides opportunities for innovative master planned communities such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and Conservation Subdivisions.

Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) are master planned communities that may include a mixture of housing types and sizes all within one development or subdivision. PUDs may also include a Neighborhood Activity Center component of convenience shopping, recreational facilities, or open space. Buildings are often clustered within PUDs in order to provide for collectively owned parks, trails, and open space. PUDs allow for greater development flexibility while increasing administrative discretion and negotiating power.

Conservation Subdivisions are an approach to laying out residential subdivisions so that a significant percentage of buildable uplands are permanently protected in such a manner as to create interconnected networks of conservation lands. This style of development keeps the same gross density as a traditional subdivision, but more closely clusters houses together on a portion of the total lot in order to preserve conservation land for communal enjoyment. In theory, this concept may be applied to other residential density categories, but it is restricted to the Medium Density Residential development area in Smyrna.
**URBAN RESIDENTIAL (6 UNITS/ACRE AND OVER)**

Urban Residential areas provide opportunities for high density attached housing of both owner-occupied and rental tenure. This development area includes townhomes, condominiums, as well as apartment developments. Urban Residential communities often provide a transitional area between Neighborhood Activity and Community Activity Centers and surrounding lower density residential neighborhoods. Urban Residential areas are also compatible with adjacent mixed-use development. This development area encourages pedestrian accessibility to nearby Activity Centers, Mixed Use districts, and redevelopment of older multi-family housing into condominiums and townhomes.

Many of the City’s existing Urban Residential communities are located along high-volume corridors such as Cobb Parkway and South Cobb Drive. Both of these corridors have been identified as areas for targeted redevelopment and improvement. In many ways, the fate of these Urban Residential communities is intertwined with their adjacent commercial corridors. Redevelopment proposals in this area are encouraged to allow for mixed-use redevelopment of older shopping centers along with surrounding apartments with both pedestrian and automobile connectivity with adjacent activity centers.

**NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITY CENTER**

Neighborhood Activity Centers are neighborhood focal points with a concentration of small commercial, civic, and public activities. Uses within Neighborhood Activity Centers are intended to be local-serving. Development within these areas is encouraged to be pedestrian-oriented and compatible with surrounding single-family residential areas, and at a smaller scale of intensity than Community Activity Centers. Neighborhood Activity Centers are typically less than 10 acres in total area, with small-scale commercial establishments each less than 5,000 square feet in size, and two stories or less. Neighborhood Activity Centers are normally found at the intersection of collector streets which serve residential areas.

Commercial buildings within Neighborhood Activity Centers are intended to be oriented to streets that are easily accessible from adjacent neighborhoods. Buildings should have minimal front setbacks for easy accessibility by pedestrians (such as zero lot line). Building entrances should be oriented toward streets; corner buildings should have corner entrances whenever possible. When it is not practical or reasonable to orient building entrances toward existing streets, a new “shopping street” with sidewalks and pedestrian amenities can be created within the commercial center. Developments should include sidewalks with a street furniture zone.

Apartments (left), townhomes (right), and other housing types with densities over 6 du/a are permitted within the Urban Residential category. Single-family detached homes on smaller lots also fall into this category.
Parking and vehicle drives should be located away from building entrances, and not allowed between a building entrance and the street. Surface parking should be shared and oriented behind or to the side of buildings. Landscaped buffering should be provided between parking lots, adjacent sidewalks, and adjacent residential land uses.

**COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER**

Community Activity Centers are regional focal points containing a mix of commercial, professional, civic, and public uses. Community Activity Centers are designed to accommodate commercial uses serving several adjacent neighborhoods. Community Activity Centers have been established along major arterials and at key intersections where development nodes can be supported by the regional transportation network. While Community Activity Centers are more automobile-oriented than Neighborhood Activity Centers, basic access and safety should be provided for pedestrians.

A transition in building scale and land use type should be provided between higher intensity uses and adjacent residential areas. Urban Residential areas may serve as a transition between Community Activity Centers and lower density Suburban Residential areas. This transition in uses removes such high intensity centers from single-family neighborhoods and serves to buffer nearby neighborhoods. In addition, more intense uses should be focused on those properties in the center of the Community Activity Center and away from existing residential development.

**MIXED USE**

A prime example of the mixed use development area is the Smyrna Market Village. The Market Village serves as the symbolic heart of the City as a mixed use live/work/play district that provides a venue for gatherings, events, and civic activities. It also provides a unique sense of place and identity for Smyrna, along with a vibrant mix of uses within easy walking distance. Like the Market Village, other mixed use redevelopment of key Community Activity Centers will help revitalize aging commercial areas and serve as a positive amenity for surrounding residential areas. Two key examples are the Belmont and Jonquil developments, both of which are integrated with the City’s existing downtown area.

The Future Development Map also encourages additional Mixed Use redevelopment areas at key intersections along major corridors such as South Cobb Drive and Cobb Parkway. South Cobb Drive has been identified as a redevelopment corridor in both the Cobb County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Smyrna Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) Study. Mixed Use redevelopment will be encouraged along South Cobb Drive at its intersections with Windy Hill Road and Concord Road.
OFFICE / PROFESSIONAL

The Office / Professional development area seeks to encourage office park development in appropriate locations such as around the Cumberland CID/Galleria regional activity center in an effort to diversify and strengthen the City’s economic base. Supportive commercial retail and services are also considered appropriate within these areas.

INDUSTRIAL AREA

Industrial development areas provide suitable locations for industrial employment which do not conflict with residential areas. Clean, light industrial uses that have minimal impact on nearby residential use are encouraged, as well as transportation/warehousing/distribution uses carefully planned to avoid freight traffic impacts on residential areas. In addition to industrial uses, some supportive commercial development is also appropriate within industrial areas. Office uses may also be integrated into some light industrial, distribution, and warehousing developments. For example, the Highlands Parkway corridor includes office parks along with some light industrial and distribution uses.

PUBLIC / INSTITUTIONAL

Public/Institutional areas consist of government and civic nodes that provide services to surrounding neighborhoods. Public / Institutional buildings often serve as the anchor for Neighborhood Activity Centers. Public / Institutional areas are compatible with both residential neighborhoods and activity centers. Schools and churches are often located within neighborhoods in order to isolate children from high-traffic areas. However, intensive public uses, such as ‘mega-churches’ and city halls should be located within Community Activity Centers and Mixed Use districts. Because public/institutional uses are so integral to the character of the surrounding neighborhood, the value of keeping this category as a separate development area should be evaluated.

PARKS / RECREATION / CONSERVATION

Parks and recreational facilities form an important neighborhood asset and contribute to the overall health and quality of life of the community. This development area includes all public parks and multi-use paths and greenways such as the Silver Comet Trail. The City of Smyrna is committed to the expansion and enhancement of its system of greenways, parks, and the development of new linear park facilities. New greenways will be created connecting parks, public facilities, and activity centers. Linkages and trailside amenities will also be created between the city’s trail system, pedestrian network, and residential neighborhoods.

It should be noted that this development area for most part reflects existing parks and conserved areas at the time of the last plans adoption, not proposed or potential areas. Also as noted earlier, parks often are integral to the overall character of the surrounding neighborhood are may best be described as part of a larger development area. A close look at future park expansions and plans should be made to determine if additional areas should be included in this development area as part of this planning effort, or indeed whether the development area should be deleted and the area designated as PRC integrated into other surrounding development areas.
Table B-9. Future Development Area and Zoning Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Development Area</th>
<th>Corresponding Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Residential</td>
<td>R-30, R-20, R-15, OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>R-15, OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>R-12, RAD, PUD, OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>RAD, RMC-8, RM-10, RM-12, RM-15, RD, RD-4, RTD, OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Activity Center</td>
<td>LC, NS, FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activity Center</td>
<td>GC, MU, NS, TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>CBD, MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Professional</td>
<td>OI, OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Area</td>
<td>LI, OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks / Recreation / Conservation</td>
<td>R-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


KEY OBSERVATIONS:

- Compared to other future development or future land use maps around the state, the Smyrna Future Development Map is very prescriptive and describes the development areas in terms of primary land use at the parcel level, very similar to a zoning map. The advantage of this is that it is easy to apply and interpret, as well as transparent, because it is so specific. On the other hand, it does not offer much in the way of land use flexibility and does not necessarily enhance or reflect the distinct character of a particular area, for example, where design overlays may be applied. Through this planning process, the City may want to consider revising the current palette of development areas it uses.

- The adopted plan had identified as an issue that “Our community’s land use/development regulations and Future Land Use map do not match.” This point needs to be further explored through the public involvement process to see if this perspective is still shared today.
### Table B-10. Future Development Area Acreage Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Development Areas</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent Total Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Residential</td>
<td>4,285.2</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>798.7</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>1,056.5</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>879.9</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Activity Center</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activity Center</td>
<td>442.6</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>631.4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Professional</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Area</td>
<td>620.5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>348.8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks / Recreation / Conservation</td>
<td>316.3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Annexation Areas</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Excluding Annexation Areas)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,659.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The City of Smyrna’s natural features are typical of similar Atlanta communities close to the Chattahoochee River. It is primarily characterized by a mature tree canopy, a protected stream network, and sloping topography. As the following evaluation of environmental planning criteria indicates, there are few natural constraints to development in the City, but those that do exist are primarily associated with the protection of the City’s water resources and associated sloping topography near the city’s watercourse network. In particular, natural constraints are most prominent along the Chattahoochee River, Nickajack Creek, Laurel Creek, and Poplar Creek. In addition, as the Topology Map indicates steep slopes are also found along both sides of the appropriately named Ridge Road.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING CRITERIA

Protecting the city’s natural environment plays an important role in furthering the quality of life for Smyrna residents and contributes to a healthy regional ecosystem that is sustainable for generations to come. The City of Smyrna’s ordinances and development regulations help achieve these important needs by including a series of provisions that maintain consistency with the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) plans and the Part 5 Environmental Planning Criteria of the Georgia Planning act that are administered by the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Consistency with these plans and criteria are described in the following section.

REGIONAL WATER PLANS

The City of Smyrna is part of the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD), which was created in 2001 to oversee regional water management for over 100 jurisdictions within metropolitan Atlanta, including Cobb County and the City of Smyrna. The MNGWPD oversees implementation of the Water Resource Management Plan, which addresses the region’s water resources and its water, wastewater, and watershed management infrastructure. The water supply and wastewater plans are implemented through water and wastewater service providers. For the City of Smyrna, the Public Works Department in conjunction with the Cobb County Watershed Stewardship Program oversees implementation of these items.

The Watershed Management Plan includes local management measures that are to be undertaken by all MNGWPD jurisdictions. These measures include five model ordinances to be adopted by all local jurisdictions within the MNGWPD. The ordinances are for Post-development Stormwater Management, Floodplain Management and Flood Damage Prevention, Stream Buffer Protection, Illicit Discharges and Illegal Connections, and Litter Control. The City of Smyrna has adopted all of these regulations as a part of its Code of Ordinances, Article V - Stormwater Quality Management:

- Article VI. Stream Buffer Protection
- Article VII. Stream Buffer Protection
- Article VIII. Illicit Discharges and Illegal Connections

Flood hazard reduction measures are addressed in Code of Ordinances, Chapter 54 - Floods. Litter control measures are addressed in Code of Ordinances, Chapter 89, Article IV - Litter.
Figure B-20. Topography Map

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission
DNR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING CRITERIA

Cobb County and its member municipalities have adopted Part V of the Georgia Planning Act, the environmental planning criteria developed by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). These standards include requirements governing development in water supply watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, and river corridors (DNR Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria).

WATER SUPPLY WATERSHEDS

Water supply watersheds are areas of land upstream of a governmentally-owned public drinking water intake. The larger a watershed is, the less susceptible it is to pollution by land development. Small watersheds are categorized as less than 100 square miles in size, and have stricter protection criteria than large watersheds. Criteria are established to allow development of a water supply watershed without contaminating the water source to a point where it cannot be treated to meet drinking water standards.

The City of Smyrna is situated within two large watersheds, the Rottenwood Creek and the Nickajack Creek Basin. Both of these areas are sub-watersheds of the Chattahoochee River Basin. Approximately 22 percent of Smyrna’s land area lies within the Rottenwood Creek Basin located above the City of Atlanta’s water intake. The only water supply watershed criteria that must be adhered to is the regulation of new facilities located within seven miles of the water supply intake that handle hazardous materials of the types and amounts as determined by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR). This seven mile radius shown on the Water Supply Watershed map, and as can be seen nearly all of the city lands lie within it.

WETLANDS

Wetlands within Smyrna are classified as Palustrine Systems. Palustrine systems include all non-tidal wetlands dominated by trees, shrubs, emergents, mosses, or lichens. Palustrine subsystem classifications found in Smyrna include aquatic bed, emergent, forested, scrub-shrub, and unconsolidated bottom. DNR’s criteria list five categories of wetlands that require identification and mapping: open water, non-forested emergent, scrub-shrub, forested, and altered wetlands. Thirteen forested wetlands and one scrub-shrub wetland are identified within Smyrna along stream banks and ponds, as shown in Figure B-21; however, given the small, combined wetland area of approximately 22 acres, no further city-level protection measures are considered necessary. Other existing federal and state laws are applicable to wetlands and their protection.

GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS

Groundwater recharge areas are areas where water infiltrates into the ground to replenish an aquifer. According to the U.S. Geological Survey and the Georgia Department of Resources, there are no groundwater recharge areas located within the city limits of Smyrna.

PROTECTED RIVER CORRIDORS

The City of Smyrna lies within the Upper Chattahoochee and the Middle Chattahoochee-Lake Harding Basins, which are tributaries to the Chattahoochee River. The City is in compliance with the Metropolitan River Protection Act’s Chattahoochee River Tributary Protection Ordinance. The City forwards development and land-disturbing applications within 2,000 feet of the Chattahoochee’s banks to ARC for consistency review, the location of the buffer can be seen on the Water Features Map. Proposals that are consistent with the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan are then permitted and monitored by the City.
Figure B-21. Water Features Map

Sources: City of Smyrna GIS Department; Atlanta Regional Commission; Georgia Department of Community Affairs; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
Furthermore, the City has adopted other water protection ordinances. Smyrna requires a more stringent stream buffer of 50 feet on all state waters, instead of the state mandated 25 feet. The City is in compliance with the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District’s stormwater protection requirements. The City has a Litter Control ordinance, and has adopted the following Planning District’s model ordinances.

- Post Development Stormwater Management for New Development and Redevelopment
- Floodplain Management/Flood Damage Prevention
- Conservation Subdivision/Open Space Development
- Illicit Discharge & Illegal Connection
- Stream Buffer Protection

PROTECTED MOUNTAINS

There are no protected mountains located within the city limits of Smyrna according to Georgia’s Department of Community Affair’s map of protected mountain areas.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- The City is compliant with the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District plans and the Part 5 Environmental Planning Criteria of the Georgia Planning act that are administered by the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS OF RELATED STUDIES

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2030

The existing City of Smyrna Comprehensive Plan 2030 serves as the foundation for this update, and as such serves as a reference point for this assessment. Indeed, many of the findings from Comprehensive Plan 2030 prepared have either not changed or changed little. This is particularly true of the assessment of natural resources. Changes to the plan are being driven by development projects both within and near the city boundaries, minor changes in the city boundaries due to annexations, and recent planning studies. Through this comprehensive planning process, the land use recommendations and policies, particularly as expressed through the Future Development Map and its supportive narrative will be evaluated and revised if appropriate.

SMYRNA STRATEGIC VISION PLAN

The Smyrna Strategic Vision Plan not only defines an overall city vision that will be evaluated and integrated into this plan, but also lays out a detailed implementation plan that includes a few land use related recommendations. In particular, the plan in short term (2015-2016) spelled out two action items: (1) “Evaluate the competitiveness of City incentives for new mixed-use development,” and (2) “Create gateways into Smyrna that are recognizable and distinct.” Incentives for mixed use development could take the form of zoning code modifications, so the follow-up efforts to implement this task should be reviewed. The other action item of creating gateways can be as simple as installing new monument signs or as complex as creating architectural design guidelines that facilitate an inviting character that is reflective of the city at its main entry points. The Future Development Map could play an important supportive role in this effort.
SPRING ROAD LCI STUDY

Another key planning effort is the Spring Road LCI Study. Final recommendations from that study will be evaluated in the implementation planning phase of the project. A companion effort was undertaken by Georgia Tech, who was working on a Studio Report related to the Spring Road Gateway to Smyrna. Final recommendations of the report will be evaluated in the implementation planning phase of the project.

GEORGIA TECH STUDIO SMYRNA CROSSROADS STUDY

In coordination with the Spring Road LCI Study, graduate students in the Georgia Tech School of City and Regional Planning completed a vision plan for the Spring Road gateway area near SunTrust Park in December 2016. Land use recommendations for the gateway area include: 1) higher density, mixed-use development near the intersection of Spring Road and Cobb Parkway; 2) medium density, mixed-use development transitioning west into residential neighborhoods; 3) an infill traditional residential neighborhood; and 4) the creation of Jonquil Park, funded by a potential Tax Allocation District (TAD).

SOUTH COBB DRIVE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT STUDY

The South Cobb Drive Corridor Improvement Study addressed the segment of South Cobb Drive between Concord Road and Windy Hill Road. The study developed alternative concepts for the road as a multi-modal corridor, including strategies to improve safety, connectivity, and capacity on the roadway. It also examines appropriate land uses, redevelopment opportunities, and aesthetic improvements to the corridor. A preferred alternative will be selected and adopted in late Spring 2017.
KEY OBSERVATIONS:

1. From a land use perspective, there are a few recommendations from the Vision Plan that can be further explored as part of updating the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, an evaluation of the City’s incentives for mixed use developments and creation of distinct gateways.

2. The Spring Road LCI Study efforts need to be monitored to see what land use recommendations need to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

KEY FINDINGS

1. The City is built out, new development will take the form of redevelopment along the major commercial corridors, particularly along Spring Road and South Cobb Drive.

2. With the city being primarily residential, the quality of schools has a significant impact on future growth. It must be recognized, however, that decisions of school expansion, location and curriculum are not under the jurisdiction of the City Government, but rather the Cobb County School District.

3. Spin off effects from SunTrust Park (Spring Road Corridor) will have a direct impact on redevelopment efforts along Spring Road, and the City has undertaken a planning effort to address and study what those impacts and preferred vision for the Spring Road corridor should be. The final recommendations of the Spring Road LCI Study will be incorporated into the recommendations of this update based on direction from City staff.

4. Overlay Districts are inconsistent in application, process and procedure and should be standardized in the code to improve their utility, this update will offer high level recommendations as to how to revise the code.

5. The current Future Development Map, also known as the Future Land Use Map, is very land use specific, could be improved by reflecting character of different neighborhoods and incorporating overlay design districts, but this is a decision that will be explored through the public engagement process and will be to the City Council to determine if changes are needed.

6. There are few natural constraints for further development in the City, and there are policies and regulations in place to protect natural resources that would be threatened by future development. This too will be a topic to explore with public through this planning process, to determine if further protections are needed or desired and should be revised.
INTRODUCTION

High performing, multi-modal transportation infrastructure is crucial to maintaining quality-of-life for Smyrna residents, supporting local businesses, and ensuring the future success of the City. This section provides an assessment of mobility in Smyrna, addressing the existing and planned multi-modal transportation system. The key strategies guiding future transportation projects in Smyrna include the Cobb County Comprehensive Transportation Plan 2040 – Cobb in Motion (completed in 2015), and The Atlanta Regional Commission’s (ARC) ‘Atlanta Region’s Plan’ (updated in March 2016). Other plans that will provide targeted improvements to the City’s transportation network include the Smyrna Spring Road Corridor Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) Study and the South Cobb Drive Corridor Improvement Study, and the Georgia Department of Transportation’s (GDOT) Major Mobility Investment Program (MMIP).

TRANSPORTATION PLANS AND STRATEGIC PROJECTS

ATLANTA REGION’S PLAN

The ARC’s ‘Atlanta Region’s Plan’ is a long-range transportation strategy for infrastructure investment to improve mobility in the region. The plan aims to provide Atlanta with world-class infrastructure to build a competitive economy and develop healthy, livable communities. The plan allocates funding for the following project with significant impact for Smyrna.

The ARC Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2021 that is part of the plan allocates $42.05 million to the Windy Hill Boulevard Widening and Complete Streets Project in north Smyrna. This project is a jointly funded project between Cobb County and City of Smyrna and will reconstruct the existing 5-lane roadway between South Cobb Drive and Atlanta Road with a multi-modal boulevard. The proposed roadway will accommodate all forms of travel including vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit and reduce congestion by providing four limited access express through lanes. The project will incorporate complete streets design guidelines, promoting pedestrian and cyclist use and safety through landscaping, lighting, and street furniture.
MAJOR MOBILITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM (MMIP)

Through the MMIP, the Georgia DOT has focused on 11 major mobility investment projects to strategically reduce congestion along key freight and passenger corridors by improving road and bridge infrastructure. Several of these highway projects will impact traffic flow in and around Smyrna, including two new express lanes in each direction on I-285 from I-75 to I-85 and one new express lane in each direction on I-285 from I-20 to I-75.

SPRING ROAD LCI STUDY

The Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) is a program offered by the Atlanta Regional Commission that encourages local governments to implement strategies that link transportation improvements with land use development strategies to create sustainable, livable communities. The Spring Road Corridor LCI aims to improve the aesthetics and functionality of Spring Road, a key corridor in Smyrna. The study focuses on guiding redevelopment along Spring Road, identifying appropriate investment projects and enabling Spring Road to benefit from its strategic location near Cumberland CID and SunTrust Park.

GEORGIA TECH STUDIO SMYRNA CROSSROADS STUDY

In coordination with land use recommendations (see page B51), the Georgia Tech Smyrna Crossroads Study proposes improvements to the transportation system in and around the Spring Road gateway area near SunTrust Park. The study proposes citywide recommendations, such as pedestrian/bicycle connections and transit service to better connect the study area with surrounding neighborhoods. Within the study area, recommendations include: 1) incrementally building out a connected street network; 2) improved pedestrian crossings; and 3) a street hierarchy comprised of vehicular thoroughfares, multi-modal connectors, and neighborhood greenway typologies.

SOUTH COBB DRIVE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT STUDY

Similarly, the City of Smyrna, in association with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), is conducting a Corridor Improvement Study (CIS) for South Cobb Drive (SR 280) between Concord Road and Windy Hill Road. South Cobb Drive is an important north-south corridor, providing access to I-75 and I-285 and commercial, retail, and office centers in Smyrna. The City of Smyrna’s vision for South Cobb Drive is to transform the transportation arterial into a dynamic retail, residential, and mixed-use commercial corridor.

The Spring Road, Windy Hill Road, and South Cobb Drive projects will complement Market Village and Atlanta Road to enhance and connect Smyrna’s network of walkable and vibrant centers. These projects will improve mobility options in Smyrna, encouraging active transportation and supporting future economic and population in the city. The recommendations from these studies should be incorporated and reflected in the recommendations of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Proposed street network for the Georgia Tech Smyrna Crossroads Study