

With the addition and subtraction of items the line numbers have changed please see current, 1st draft and current draft for references.

Line 17 - This is a contradiction of the prohibited line items under line 13. Uses such as listed above in please add to prohibited uses. **Corrected**

29 **Will having an HOA be required of the Single Family and Townhomes in the PUV? If so, please include this language in the PUV. (This covered in 119-221-C)**

49-54 Here there is no mention of "lofts" or "flats". They are mentioned later on as an option. Should these terms actually be referred to as "apartments"? **No they are lofts or flats**

Lines 49-54: only 25% increments - is this a realistic expectation for a PUV? (I do like the exception rule on lines 54 and 55) **Yes**

54-57 and no building or occupancy permit shall be issued for any structure or use until such time as the 25% has been completed, and any such structure or use shall be in full accord with the requirements and limitations set forth in this ordinance. (Added) per council

Building Permit Concurrency – Does the concurrency of the residential component stated in the paragraph include the “loft” style residences that can be constructed? If so, please include language to support this.

Uses – As was noted in the meeting, please provide VERY specific definitions of each of these items. The Permitted and Prohibited purpose of a PUV, is to encourage a number of mixed uses to include: Institutional, Cultural, Office, Retail and Residential. By prohibiting certain items, namely offices and cultural this seems contradictory and confusing. I also believe that it needs to be *very clearly* stated what undesirable businesses should be prohibited. . (**Line 4 Industrial, Office have been removed from the intended use**)

With drive-thru services being listed as prohibited, would a bank then not be allowed to have a drive-thru. **No.**

84 Please define. **Addressed in prohibited use**

85 Night Clubs or locations such as Chucky Cheese? **(Night Clubs would be governed by the Alcohol ordinance. Chucky Cheese would be classified as an eating establishment)**

88 Would this be a book store or a stand-a-lone church? **(Church)**

91 - Please add Manufactured Buildings (Added to line 88)

94 This would eliminate nail salons and spas - which contradicts with #6 in permitted uses. These types of business would thrive in a PUV. Contactor's offices in specific - I do not understand this reasoning. Addressed in allowed use (line 84)

94 Gas stations/C Stores are not expressly addressed in the ordinance to be allowed or prohibited. Should it be so? Addressed in prohibited use (line 113)

95 Please define Clubs (Adult Establishments or bookstores?) Not applicable to 98, Adult establishments are addressed in the Adult Ordinance

95 I have a huge problem with this. This would prohibit service organizations from having a space here (ie; Lions, Rotary, Historical Society, etc.) Consumes too much parking from retail

99 Hotel and B&B Inns are prohibited. Would it enhance the city's amenities to allow a small number of B&B's? Perhaps the council might consider restricting both the number of operators and the maximum stay per guest/occasion to discourage extended stay establishments. (Can be discussed with Council)

107 Why not? (Consumes too much parking from retail and carried over from existing ordinance)

111 Why not? (Moms could shop while child is in class/practice) (Consumes too much parking from retail)

Please add: Addressed in prohibited use (lines 114-116)

Tattoo Parlors / Vape Shops

No Title Loan

112 Please define difference between Fitness Center and Health Center. Addressed in prohibited use (line 112)

118 Lofts" are not mentioned here but are in sections prior. Doesn't this need to be uniform if apartments are going to be allowed above commercial uses? (lofts/Flats are allowed as an accessory not a requirement)

118 Site Design Standards – Please include all language supporting the building of “lofts” in the proposed land use mix, (Item 1: a-d). It seems like “lofts”, as presented is an afterthought. I understand that lofts are not a requirement of the project, as single family and townhomes are, but it should all be defined together under one heading, even if you include the language that “lofts” are optional. (lofts/Flats are allowed as an accessory not a requirement)

122 All verbiage changed to open space from green space

181 It may be too late for this but I would like to see language that all detention for a project this size, be underground. I would like to avoid another empty, ugly detention pond like in the case of the Freddy's/Region's Bank/Valvoline development. (Can be discussed with Council)

184-196 All verbiage changed to open space from green space

198 These buffer areas could be unsightly. (Buffers are to remain undisturbed)

243 - there is a double "that". One needs to be removed. (Corrected)

261 Regarding "Design features for nonresidential and mixed-use buildings section (a) All building shall incorporate a minimum of four of the following features. Buildings with a length of 200 feet or greater shall incorporate at minimum of six design features:" The language appears slightly vague or leaves room for interpretation. Is it 4 or 6 per item or per type? For example, can a builder incorporate 4 or 6 balconies and meet the requirement? (For buildings under 200 feet 4 of the design criteria listed as 1-14 must be used. For building over 200 feet 6 criteria must be used.

323 Regarding Garages: the language prohibiting front-loading garages was removed in it's entirety. Will front-loading garages be allowed at all or are they prohibited? Language to address either option should be added. (Front loading garages are not prohibited)

I'd like to see all other references to overall City Municipal code referred to or attached to the PUV. (Development regs govern what the puv does not)

Lastly, now is the time to clarify all explanations and definitions before a project like this gets started. The PUV should be such a comprehensive document that it incorporates all other aspects of Loganville's development regulations, as it pertains to this project, in one place. It should not be the goal of the city to minimize the amount of time a developer has to spend to incorporate our policies. (The PUV is not a stand alone comprehensive document, Its is a zoning classification as with any other zoning in the city)