

Comments on Dunwoody Perimeter Center Overlay and Districts Draft

March 2016

Perimeter Center Overlay

<i>Section</i>	<i>CQG Comment (November 2015 Draft)</i>	<i>Response (March 2016 Draft)</i>
(a)(7)a. Minor Exceptions (page 3.)	<p>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)</p> <p>Standards for modification approvals should be written into the code</p>	Not Addressed. Still doesn't provide enough authority for the Community Development Director to make exceptions.
(b) (2) b.4. Applicability (pg. 3)	Why are Signs included here? This is a separate issue that should be covered in sign ordinance	Addressed. Removed.
(b)(3)d. Shared-Use Paths (pg. 4)	This is an 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?	Not addressed. Some locations identified on map are already used as walking trails
(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.	Property owner responsible for maintenance.
(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	Not addressed.
(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	Not addressed. Other materials can be approved through administrative approval process
(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	Not addressed. Examples of gas stations with less than 50% fuel and parking areas can be added
(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	Not addressed.
(e)(2)c. 7 Points Minimum (pg.31)	Does this requirement apply to redevelopment/renovations? What standards are being used to assign weight (points) to various measures?	Renovations stricken from draft

(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	Addressed. Site within ¼ mile of existing or proposed transit stop.
Perimeter Center Districts		
<i>Section</i>	<i>CQG Comment</i>	<i>Additional Comments/ Feedback</i>
(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%.	Not addressed.
(a)(5) New Streets and Blocks (Regulating Map) (pg. 10)	How were the “New Streets” identified? Many are splitting parcels. How are property owners involved in this process?	Locations on map are conceptual.
(b) PC-1 District Requirements (pg. 12)	Maximum height should be increased to 40 stories to be consistent with current Perimeter Center Skyline	Not addressed.
(c) PC-2 District Requirements (pg. 13)	Maximum height should be increased to 20 stories. There are buildings here currently taller than that.	Not addressed
(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” ?	Not addressed.
(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).	Not addressed.
(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.	Not addressed.
27-106 Open Space Types (pg. 40)	Preserving existing open space should count towards the minimum open space requirement.	Addressed. Existing open space may be used to meet minimum requirement at the discretion of the city.
(b)(4) Fee-in-lieu (pg. 40)	What is the calculation for open space fee in lieu?	Cost of building the improvement