Development Standards -- Sticky Note Comments

(Comments grouped by topic)

<u>Planning for Trees:</u>
Make stormwater part of the tree conservation planning process; deny permits to builders who don't plan for trees; hold developers more accountable for tree removal and clear cutting.

- Need to include trees and Watershed Management together and at the <u>beginning</u> of planning
- Promote trees as a resources/BMP for stormwater.
- Stormwater credit. This may be the deciding factor, forcing compliance (& acceptance?)
- Must change the conversation to preservation instead of removing.
- Respect trees, steam buffers; don't build to setbacks on lots; serious financial penalties for illegal tree removal.
- Global warming. We need all trees!
- How about deny permits to any plans for a single family home that require tree removal to build? If the developers hired proper architects, they could probably fit trees with existing lots. Are we an urban city or not?
- Afford a "buildable lot" is an escape clause for protecting trees.
- Have developers have open public meetings if they plan cut trees. Make them accountable.
- I want to call out builders that claim to be "green" & then clear cut & fight the neighborhood when we complain.
- We need a <u>moratorium</u> or <u>partial moratorium</u> on developer clear-cutting while this rewrite is being done! No excuse, no favors, no exceptions.

<u>Deterrents to Illegal Tree Removal:</u>
Need to increase penalties to effectively stop illegal tree removal: increase fines, put a moratorium on future work permits, deny certificate of occupancy, revoke developer's license.

- Those that illegally take down trees INCREASE from $500 for 1st tree to $2,000 and for every tree thereafter, $1000 to $2,000 to $5,000.
- Current fees and fines too lows to deter high value and/or illegal tree removal. Must go higher to protect more trees.
- For developers or private residents who illegally take down trees, there should be a stoppage of work permits for the future or a time set for no more developing onsite. DC ordinances.
- Rather than a monetary fine, consider taking developer's license to build as a penalty for tree removal. Would this not encourage new development concepts?
- Suspend developer's ability to build if trees are removed without approval.
- Monitor developers. Previous problem developers – Fined.
- If increased fees aren't a sufficient deterrent, it will only be built back in the construction or development cost. Sanctions should include denial of C/O. revocation of license.
- Substantive fees to the builder WILL stop them. $50K! Why not? Is ATL afraid the charge the real value a tree is worth to the city?!
- You gotta make removal illegal & have our city be accountable for it.
- Take developers to task.

Impervious Surfaces and Grading:
Need to protect soil by reducing grading and impervious surfaces; use existing footprint.
- Must address imperious surfaces.
- Must save the soil. Stop the grading!
- (In reference to "Encourage better site design…") Not just encourage!! Must enforce a maximum sustainable footprint. Reduce grading and impervious surface.
- Must save the soil. Stop the grading!
- Like to see specifics, i.e., "X % building footprint" or "No more than X percent grading".
- Must address imperious surfaces.
- Compare footprint with existing and include driveway.

Transparency and Trust:
Lack of faith in the streamlined review process to protect trees and prevent corruption.
- With no enforcement and no transparency this is a waste of time and effort.
- Do <u>not</u> understand streamlined process w/no appeal/posting rec'd. This opens up to misinterpretation/corruption due to lack of oversight.
- The arborists aren't enforcing the ordinance today. How can we trust them to do so under and new ordinance?
- Question: Dies city have the staff? Is there a commitment to tree protection?
- It cannot be that the city cannot stop this!

Tree Recompense and Planting/Replanting:
Plant more street trees, native trees, tie recompense with land value, remove recompense caps.
- Encourage more street trees. Not enough room on Peachtree. Need to make more room for street trees.
- Replant with w/natives!! Crepe myrtles don't <u>count</u>.
- Increase tree (covered by other sticky note) (word indecipherable) X 2 for each tree & inch per diameter.
- Need to replant meaningful species inch for inch… C.O.O. depends on evaluation.
- Recompense is so small to Buckhead, VaHi, and Chastain developer; get rid of cap of fees!

Tree Valuation:
Trees must be valued in terms of lifetime ecological value and contribution to the future canopy.
- Value of trees must include ecosystem services though the average lifetime of that species.
- (In reference to "Protect all high value trees possible") "Possible" is a big problem. Creates a nebulous situation.
- Smaller trees are important, too. They are our future forests. If we allow 12-20" trees t be cut, we won't have forests for future generations.
- Save trees that are "good" trees.

Education:

Need more educational services about trees for the public, architects and engineers; need to understand regulation definitions better.

- Public education is key. Even architects and engineers need classes to understand trees.
- Engineers need to upgrade understanding of trees & stormwater. (Another person added the comment: Agree) .
- (In reference to "Regulations could reference or include…") Please explain/provide more details on these descriptions/definitions.