|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comments on Dunwoody Perimeter Center Overlay and Districts Draft**  February 2016 | | |
| **Perimeter Center Overlay** | | |
| *Section* | *CQG Comment* | *Additional Comments/ Feedback* |
| (a)(7)a. Minor Exceptions (page 3.) | There is not enough administration relief here. The Community Development Director should have the authority to make exceptions on all standards 10 to 20%. (Alpharetta does this) Why were 1. through 3. Removed?  Standards for modification approvals should be written into the code |  |
| (b) (2) b.4. Applicability (pg. 3) | Why are Signs included here? This is a separate issue that should be covered in sign ordinance |  |
| (b)(3)d. Shared-Use Paths (pg. 4) | This is a huge exaction (requiring public dedication, construction/paving and tree planting) that should be a condition of zoning consented to by individual developers, not required by overlay. It is unclear on the map how the required trail segments link into a greater trail system and appear to only impact five parcels in the overlay? |  |
| (b)(4)e.9. Streetscape Maintenance Procedure (pg. 6) | Need to clarify this requirement. Are developments required to dedicate right-of-way AND submit a maintenance procedure? This should also be condition of zoning. |  |
| (b)(5)-(8)c. (Various Street Types) Dedication (pg. 8, 11, 14, and 19) | Right-of-way dedication should not be required in overlay. This is an exaction that should be a condition of zoning consented to by developers on a case-by-case basis |  |
| (d)(3)a.  Major Façade Materials (pg.24) | Restricting 80% of each façade to brick, stone or glass may be too limiting. Many high-quality mid-rise developments utilize cement-based stucco and wood lap in construction |  |
| (d)(8) Fueling Stations | Why are these standards included when fueling stations are permitted in district uses?  Limiting parking and fuel areas to 50% of frontage may be unreasonable |  |
| (e) Sustainability Measures (pg.30-32) | Sustainability measures should be tied to development incentives. There also does not appear to be any motivation for builders to go beyond minimum requirements |  |
| (e)(2)c. 7 Points Minimum (pg.31) | Did this requirement only apply to redevelopment/renovations in earlier drafts? What standards are being used to assign weight (points) to various measures? |  |
| (e)(4)j. Transportation Access Measure (pg. 32) | This measure should include points for sites located within a quarter and/or half mile of the MARTA station |  |
| **Perimeter Center Districts** | | |
| *Section* | *CQG Comment* | *Additional Comments/ Feedback* |
| (b)(5) Relief (pg.7) | Similarly to the Overlay, there is not enough administration relief here. The Community Development Director should have the authority to make exceptions on all standards 10 to 20%. |  |
| (a)(5) New Streets and Blocks (Regulating Map)  (pg. 10) | How were the “New Streets” identified? Many are splitting parcels w |  |
| (b) PC-1 District Requirements  (pg. 12) | Maximum height should be increased to 40 stories to be consistent with current Perimeter Center Skyline |  |
| (c) PC-2 District Requirements  (pg. 13) | Maximum height should be increased to 20 stories |  |
| (f) Uses (pg. 17) | CQG Supports the inclusion of owner-occupied and Age-restricted multi-unit residential by-right in PC-1 district to achieve “live, work, play” community |  |
| (b)(2)b.12 – Ground Story Uses (pg. 26) | What is being accomplished by limiting to “office category; retail sales and service uses limited to 25% of gross floor area” ? |  |
| (b)(2)c.17 Required Number of Street Entrances (pg. 28) | Requiring 4 of every 5 townhomes to front on street is contrary to how many townhome developments are designed, and is driven by the shape and depth of the development parcel (many developments are designed with townhomes fronting a community greenspace). |  |
| (b)(2)d.3 Detached House – Parking Along Frontage (pg.30) | Parking along frontage should be permitted (with alley access preferred) along primary streets, as it is along parkway and Secondary street frontages. |  |
| 27-106 Open Space Types (pg. 40) | Preserving existing open space should count towards the minimum open space requirement. Why was this removed? |  |
| (b)(4) Fee-in-lieu  (pg. 40) | What is the calculation for open space fee in lieu? |  |