

| Date      | UDO Part                       | UDO Section/Page        | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/10/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3 General Definitions | 2.3 (Page 2-22): Definition of 'Flag Lot'. There are many irregular lots within the City, and division or recombination of parcels may lead to the creation of irregular lots. Per the proposed ordinance 'flag lots' are prohibited (16.1.C). To avoid unintended restriction of irregular lots, I recommend narrowing the definition of 'flag lots' by specifying the minimum width of the 'pole'. For example, 16.1.B.7 of the draft provides that minimum lot frontage for cul-de-sac lots is 15 feet, which by definition actually creates a flag lot -- which at the same time is prohibited by 16.1.C.   | Staff believes the diagram shown on page 2-33 of the public hearing draft provides sufficient guidance to avoid flag lots.<br><br>Staff disagrees with the notion that the cul-de-sac frontage requirements automatically create flag lots.   | No                       |
| 6/10/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3 General Definitions | The front setback measuring point is not very clear. It states that it is from "future back of curb". However, in previous ordinances like the TOD ordinance, this had the caveat of if on-street parking is used it would be measure from the adjacent travel lane.<br><br>Right now for example, it could be read that the 20' setback on a 4-lane boulevard (like Tryon or South Blvd) would need to have a bike lane and onstreet parking per the streets map and then have an additional 24' setback. This presents an unnecessary amount of space when an 8' amenity or planting strip and 8' sidewalk can then fit.  | The UDO will rely on the Charlotte Streets Map to establish the location of the future back of curb (except for Local Streets). It is measured from the road centerline. For example, South Boulevard near East Boulevard is a 4+ Lane Avenue with separated bike lanes and on-street parking. The future back of curb would be 42.5' from the center line on each side of the street. The 8' amenity zone and 8' sidewalk would be within the setback, not in addition to it.  | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 1.4                     | Applicability of old CD plans needs further definition and understanding of what is vested (specific articles, ordinances such as zoning, pcso, trees, subdivision, etc)  | Existing conditional (CD) plans will retain their zoning district designations and approved site plan conditions, and remain in effect under the Zoning Ordinance regulations in place at the time of adoption of the conditional zoning district. This also includes PCSO, Trees and Subdivision/Streets regulations. This will be clarified in the next draft. All conditionally zoned sites will be considered for alignment zoning after the UDO goes into effect. Most alignment zoning will occur in conjunction with the community area planning process.  | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3                     | Build to % DEF - Build To Percentage should be allowed to count open space between building and street. sites with irregular shapes, or distances, should qualify for open space and remove the 'bounded' by a building requirement. in addition, what is the rational for 18" above/below grade, sites with significant slope would make this difficult. recommend atleast 36". refer to 500 East Morehead which has a great outdoor public/private space that is elevated above the sidewalk but activates the street on a sloping site. this would not qualify in the new regulations.   | Open space does not have to be bounded by a building unless it is counted toward meeting a Build-To Percentage requirement.<br><br>As long as the access to the outdoor space is 24" average above or below grade (changed from 18" to 24" in the second draft) it should meet the standard. The reason for this distance is that open spaces that are any higher or lower than the adjacent grade do not effectively animate the streetscape. Staff thinks 500 East Morehead would meet the Build-To Percentage regardless because the building's entire front facade would fall within the likely Build-To Zone for this site, which would probably be zero to 20' behind the minimum frontage setback. | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3                     | Clarify would open air dining under structure quality (Leroy Fox patio?); Trellis?  | Staff believes the open air dining at Leroy Fox on South Boulevard would meet the standard.   | No                       |
| 6/24/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3                     | The definitions fail to define pedestrians and accessibility. Please add these needed definitions :<br>1. Pedestrian: "A pedestrian is anyone who travels on foot as well as those with disabilities who require assistive devices."<br>2. Accessible Pathway: "A continuous unobstructed exterior or interior path connecting all accessible elements and spaces of a district, development, building or facility."<br>3. Universal Design: Configuration enabling anyone — with or without a disability — to easily and fully access and use a facility.<br><br>The UDO and especially Article 13 - Transit Oriented Development Zoning Districts should clearly emphasize the need for accessible pathways and universal design. People with disabilities are often unable to drive or unable to afford a vehicle with adaptive equipment. Living in accessible housing by accessible pathways and in proximity to transit is key to independent living and participation in community life.<br><br>As adults with disabilities on average have substantially lower incomes than other adults, availability of subsidized accessible housing in Transit Oriented Developments should also be a priority. | 1. The suggested definition of "pedestrian" will be added in subsequent drafts of the UDO.<br>2 and 3. Staff cannot find references to these terms in the draft UDO; therefore, it would not be appropriate to list them in the Article 2.3 General Definitions.<br><br>Typically zoning regulations do not specifically address accessibility standards but rely on other standards. For example, the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual has standards for accessible sidewalks, ramps, and parking. Building codes cover other areas of accessibility.<br><br>There are standards in UDO to incentivize affordable housing.  | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part                       | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | page 2-13 the definition of Deck remains 'roofless' but plenty of decks have roof structure and no sides (or screened sides) and they are not 'porches' or 'stoops'. This definition affects uses allowed in rear setbacks and setbacks off paths. And people put roofs on decks at the time after deck is built. It takes a building permit so it could become non-conforming (& not allowed) just by this incorrect definition  | An open air deck with a roof would be considered to be a "Porch, Unenclosed" per the Article 2.3 General Definitions. Staff believes these are accurate definitions for porch and deck.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | page 2-21 Definition of Impervious Surface doe not comply with state law. impervious needs to say "Compacted" gravel per 143-214.7 (b2). Suggest you add sentence that says: "Gravel, if not compacted, is not considered Impervious." 143-214.7 (b2) says: Built-upon area" does not include a slatted deck; the water area of a swimming pool; a surface of number 57 stone, as designated by the American Society for Testing and Materials, laid at least four inches thick over a geotextile fabric; a trail as defined in G.S. 113A-85 that is either unpaved or paved as long as the pavement is porous with a hydraulic conductivity greater than 0.001 centimeters per second (1.41 inches per hour); or landscaping material, including, but not limited to, gravel, mulch, sand, and vegetation, placed on areas that receive pedestrian or bicycle traffic or on portions of driveways and parking areas that will not be compacted by the weight of a vehicle, such as the area between sections of pavement that support the weight of a vehicle. | Staff will not consider uncompacted gravel/stone used as landscaping material as built-upon area (BUA) or impervious surface as further defined in BUA guidelines. This guideline has been shared on the UDO Supporting Documents webpage and will be incorporated in to the Post Construction Stormwater Administrative Manual.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | page 2-41 definition of Tree-Disturbing Activity continues to be not reflective of what the Urban Forester says will be enforced upon taxpayers. To correct the problem the definition on page 2-41 should match page 2-13 : "creates BUA or decreases infiltration". this will allow all property owners to over-seed their grass and plant flowers (as examples of prohibited behaviors in current definition)  | The definition of tree disturbing activity needs to remain as written to adequately protect trees during more intense development. However, the heritage tree standard in Section 20.14 specifies that certain impacts will be allowed that would otherwise be prohibited by this definition of tree disturbing activity. The Charlotte Tree Manual which is currently under development will include the specifics of allowable impacts to critical root zones for heritage trees.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | page 2-42 utilities above ground (still spelled 2 different ways even in the same paragraph.) Still can't be in front set back (p 17-6) can't be in OPS (p 16-8) -- Even though OPS needs electricity and fire protection in some instances. Maybe last sentence should read: "Utilities on-site refers specifically to above ground or underground utility structures, such as backflow preventers, fire hydrants, EV charging components and utility pedestals which are not considered Above Ground Accessory Structures"  | Above ground utility structures may be located in the established frontage setback, just not the required setback which is different. The established setback is the space (if any) between the required setback line and the building.<br><br>"Utilities, On-Site" will be a separate definition. Backflow preventers will be included in this category, but fire hydrants and streetside EV chargers will not, as these are typically located in the right-of-way and not on private property subject to zoning.   | Yes                      |
| 6/29/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | Support the definition of a heritage tree" (Article 2.3): "Any tree native to North Carolina per the US Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Plants Database with a DBH of 30 inches or greater." We encourage the City to continue to keep this standard and to not lessen it.  | Staff has received and noted your statement of support.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | Article 2.3 - "Any tree native to North Carolina per the US Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Plants Database with a DBH of 30 inches or greater." Encourage the City to continue to keep this standard and to not lessen it.   | Staff has received and noted your statement of support.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction | 2.3              | Article 2.3 - Missing protection for paper streets. Encourage the City to put in tree protections for "paper streets," or unapproved rights-of-way as they do with approved rights-of-way in the UDO. Would like to see the adaption of paper streets as environmentally protected areas which adhere to the heritage tree and Tree Ordinance standards.  | City regulation protecting trees on paper rights-of-way that are not accepted by the City bring numerous legal and resource issues. These legal and resource issues outweigh the minimal amount of land across the City dedicated as paper right-of-way to warrant City acceptance and protection. The City will continue to pursue tree preservation through its programs and policies, including the Tree Canopy Preservation Program (TCPP). Abandoned areas of paper rights-of-way that become private property may become or be used as required green area. The UDO will not require heritage tree protection or allow required green area to be located in paper rights-of-way. | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                      | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction   | 2.3                                   | This definition is needed: "A pedestrian is anyone who travels on foot as well as those with disabilities who require assistive devices." (adapted from: <a href="https://www.cordiscosaille.com/faqs/who-is-considered-a-pedestrian/">https://www.cordiscosaille.com/faqs/who-is-considered-a-pedestrian/</a> ). More definitions to add: Accessible Pathway: "A continuous unobstructed exterior or interior path connecting all accessible elements and spaces of a district, development, building or facility." Universal Design - Configuration enabling anyone — with or without a disability — to easily and fully access and use a facility.   | 1. The suggested definition of "pedestrian" will be added in subsequent drafts of the UDO.<br>2 and 3. Staff cannot find references to these terms in the draft UDO; therefore, it would not be appropriate to list them in the Article 2.3 General Definitions.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction   | 2.3                                   | Definition of Gross Floor Area. We think that the definition of Gross Floor Area should be expanded. It currently says "GFA does not include any areas used exclusively for the surface parking lots and/or parking structures, or for building or equipment access, such as stairs, elevator shafts, and maintenance crawlspace." We think that the definition of GFA should also exclude ramps, common corridors, and bathrooms.  | Staff believes the definition of Gross Floor Area in the second draft UDO is sufficient and should not be expanded. The area used for surface parking, and equipment access, such as stairs, elevator shafts, and maintenance crawlspace are not part of the floor area calculation in the current zoning ordinance. Further, it is standard practice in ordinances for the area used for parking or circulation of vehicles to be excluded from gross floor area calculations. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction   | 2.3                                   | Alternatively, we encourage the city staff to include the definition of Net Floor Area as defined by the International Code Council (ICC) and incorporate Net Floor Area in the determination of parking requirements (Table 19-1)<br>Definition of Net Floor Area (ICC definition): The actual occupied area not including unoccupied accessory areas such as corridors, stairways, ramps, toilet rooms, mechanical rooms, and closets.  | Unless the definition of a word or term used in the UDO has a different or special meaning that the dictionary definition, staff has not defined it in Article 2.<br><br>Staff believes the use of Gross Floor Area (GFA) is sufficient and appropriate in relation to the standards set forth in the second draft UDO.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part I. Ordinance Introduction   | 2.3                                   | We support the definition of a heritage tree (Article 2.3): "Any tree native to North Carolina per the US Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Plants Database with a DBH of 30 inches or greater." We encourage the City to continue to keep this standard and to not lessen it.  | Staff has received and noted your statement of support.   | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards | On page 13-5, the current draft requires zero feet of side or rear setbacks as long as the TOD site is not abutting a Neighborhood 1 Place Type. I believe that if the TOD site is abutting any residential use (not just Neighborhood 1 Place Type) then a minimum side or rear setback should be required. I live in a townhouse community that abuts a TOD-UC parcel. So under these current requirements, a developer could build a 10+ story tower directly on their property line and just feet away from our community's townhomes' windows, balcony, doors, etc. There must be some protection of the existing residential use next door to the TOD property so that a developer cannot simply build up to the property line and destroy our homes' values and quality of life.   | TOD-zoned properties are typically located in transit station areas, which are intended to have high-density development to take advantage of proximity to nearby rapid transit. In these areas, setbacks are limited and designed to maximize the use of land. The standards in the draft UDO are consistent with the TOD standards currently in place. In addition to the UDO, Building Code will limit the proximity of buildings to each other.                             | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards | On page 13-6, maximum heights are adjusted down when within 200' of a Neighborhood 1 place type. Why are they not adjusted for any residential uses (detached or attached, such as townhomes) regardless of Place Type? It doesn't make sense to allow a 10-15 story tower to be built on the parcel abutting our existing townhome community without some kind of height transition / adjustments  | See above response.   | No                       |
| 6/4/2022  | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Zoning District Transla               | I dont understand the hate for what is currently R-8 zoning. Every other current zoning is allowing increased desnity and yet R-8 (not R-8MF) is being downgraded in almost every way to the inferior N1-D. I made this clear during last draft and in several meetings and the UDO team assured me it was not the intent to downgrade R-8. Many existing R-8 properties will be NON CONFORMING. Minimum lot size is going from 3500sf currently up to 4000. Why? Rear yard setback is going from 20' up to 30'. Why? Current R-8 properties 10,500sf and up allow a 35' tall quadplex but N1-D only allows up to a maximum of a 20' tall triplex. R-8 zoning is responsible for many great development opportunities for more density and affordability in this city. Many lower priced neighborhoods with R-8 are being redeveloped with duplexes that actually give new home buyers a shot at affording a home. At minimum R-8 should be changed to something that allows equal density instead of the downgrade with the new UDO. I do appreciate the new height increase for duplexes and triplexes but it is still a massive downgrade from where we currently are. This change would make many existing lots and structures non conforming and unable to do anything with. This change just doesnt make sense. | The minimum lot size for N1-D will be changed from 4,000 to 3,500. The minimum rear setback will be changed from 30' to 25'. The 20' maximum sidewall height would only limit the sidewall height of infill dwellings if the sidewall height of the adjacent buildings is less. Otherwise, the new infill dwelling's sidewall height can be the average sidewall height of the adjacent dwellings. The maximum height for residential structures is 40 feet.                    | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                           | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/4/2022  | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Zoning District Transla                    | Currently R-8 being transitioned to N1-D will leave a massive amount of non conforming structures and properties. Min lot size is going from 3500sf now to 4000sf. Rear yard is going from 20' now to 30'. Height for duplexes and triplexes are going from 35' now to 20'. This will create so many existing non conforming lots that MANY citizens will not be able to touch or do anything with except repair. If an existing structure on an R-8 lot is within the 30' rear yard setback because you guys increased the setback will that home just not be allowed to be expanded or renovated at all? Do you see how this will create a massive issue and heartache for many people?  | See above response.   | Yes                      |
| 6/13/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | 4.1. Quadraplexes on arterial streets make sense, but how will builders be incentivized to actually build these if one of the units is required to be affordable? Most will likely just build a market rate triplex. Small scale projects cannot afford to build a unit at full market cost and be restricted to affordability on the back end. 4 market rate units will be more attainable in price since you'd have smaller units compared to a market rate triplex that have larger units. Please reconsider this so we can ensure more housing inventory can be practically built with more diversity as intended.   | The zoning requirement that quadraplexes only be permitted on arterial streets in Neighborhood 1 zoning districts N1-A through N1-E is based on Policy 2.1 in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.   | No                       |
| 6/13/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Dimensional and Design St                  | 4.3.D.1.a. Applying a 20' max sidewall height meets the intent of protecting existing neighborhoods with more respective development. However, limiting a builder to max their side wall height to the average of the adjacent existing houses does not make sense. Incorporating duplexes or triplexes adjacent to other properties with one story houses will be very difficult to design for and constrains our city's ability to grow its neighborhoods incrementally.   | The 20' maximum sidewall height would accommodate two-story infill dwellings (single, duplex, or triplex), even where the adjacent dwellings are one-story. If the adjacent dwellings are taller, the infill dwelling's sidewall height may be allowed to increase above 20' by averaging the sidewall height of the adjacent dwellings.  | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | Hello again. I think I'm following somewhat. We currently are R-5 and now if, when this all passes will be a N1-C, 6000 sq ft to build upon. I'm assuming that although we are located in "Mecklenburg County" that these new rules will apply if and when approved. My thoughts are that your main thrust of building seems to be centered upon the understanding that everybody will have city water and sewer available to them.<br><br>That is not our case, we are on an acre of land, with our own well and septic. What purpose does this change serve for us? It seems more confusing to me. But, as I read it our lot would become an N1-C zoned property which could never be possible because the lack of city water and sewer. Would I be assuming correct? Thanks for your thoughts | Your current zoning district of R-5 will translate to the new UDO zoning district of N1-C when the UDO is adopted and goes into effect. This change will have absolutely no effect on your property unless you wish to expand or redevelop in the future, in which case you would need to conform to the development standards of the N1-C district. They are very similar to your current R-5 standards.<br><br>The presence or absence of municipals sewer and water service has no bearing on your zoning district but may inhibit your ability to redevelop the property in the future. | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 5-5 Section 5.3D                      | Building Height Standards note 3: "a structure within the first 100 feet is limited to a maximum of 50 feet in height" I would recommend changing 50' to 55' to allow more room for a 4-story building. 50' is very tight for a 4 story residential building, especially with a ground floor height requirement of 14'.  | Staff believes that 50' is the appropriate height for this transition requirement, as a provides a height that is more compatible with adjoining residential.   | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 5-6 and 5-7                           | Building Articulation Standards: Maximum Building Length Note 3, A, 1: The building passage requirement for buildings over 400' will be very detrimental to projects where the building does not exceed max building length by a significant amount. A building that is 20' too long will be hurt by the loss of rentable area required. Also, the required location of the passage (in the middle third of the building) will chop out a section of the garage in most wrap-style buildings. Consider implementing the passage requirement only if a building exceeds max length by more than 10%.  | The requirement to allow a building to exceed the 400 maximum length with additional design elements mandates that a pedestrian through-access be created. It should be in the middle third of the building to address the need to mid-block through access. This is only permitted in the N2-C district and is purely an option to give more flexibility for development on longer blocks.<br><br>Also, an administrative adjustment, per Section 37.4, can be pursued.  | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | Is there a map that displays the sub-type of N1 Zoning District?   | There is a map on the UDO Website that shows the sites that will be zoned one of the new N1 zoning districts after zoning translation on the UDO effective date.  | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | We need a map that will indicate the sub-type of N1. Will the HDO follow existing historic districts?  | There is a map on the UDO Website that shows the sites that will be zoned one of the new N1 zoning districts after zoning translation on the UDO effective date.<br><br>The HDO will follow existing historic districts.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                           | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/22/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | Since removing the single family zoning requirement will effectively destroy older neighborhoods without homeowner's associations, the UDO must increase the protections to the neighborhoods by ensuring the multi-family density fits the neighborhood - ie. increase the feet requirement for setbacks so these large dwellings don't overshadow the smaller homes on adjacent lots. Further, reduce the height of the buildings that will be allowed in these neighborhoods. The current UDO effectively sets in motion the destruction of these older neighborhoods - It has already begun with the buying up of these homes by investment companies just waiting to rip them down.   | The draft UDO includes provisions in Article 3 designed to maintain the character of existing neighborhoods. These include height maximum for duplexes and triplexes and driveway limitations. The setbacks are the same for all residential buildings in the N1 districts.   | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 13: TOD District                   | As someone who lives in a residential development that is technically zoned TOD-UC, it is concerning to know that there are basically no limitations to building height for properties in the area. Based on my read, it is only if the adjacent parcel is a Neighborhood 1 Place Type. There should be some consideration with respect to how close a new building can be built next to an existing residential structure. The issue is degradation of property values. I can't imagine having a 300 foot building right next to my living room window, bedroom window, etc. How is the city zoning ordinances addressing these specific issues? I appreciate living in TOD-UC means you are in a more urban area, where growth is encouraged. But there has to be some consideration given to residences that already exist, specifically that are adjacent to newly zoned TOD-UC parcels, including both building siting standards and height restrictions. I encourage the UDO code to address these specific issues, that may not be as prevalent but will be in the future given rapid growth and development.   | TOD-zoned properties are typically located in transit station areas, which are intended to have high-density development to take advantage of proximity to nearby rapid transit. Within these areas, landscape yards are not required. The standards in the draft UDO are consistent with the TOD standards currently in place. In addition to the UDO, Building Code will limit the proximity of buildings to each other.  | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 20                                 | I will admit that I am not an expert with these specific tree zoning ordinances. But as a resident of Charlotte for over 30 years, I have seen the depletion of our tree canopy and I do not think the city is doing enough to protect, promote and maintain the urban tree canopy. Removing large mature trees should require a higher fee, a larger tree is "worth" more. Developers who remove large mature trees, replace them with small trees that die and are not maintained is not a long-term strategy. The city should also be actively planting trees in medians and along sidewalks. We have increased incidents of poor air quality, which is a health issue but also an economic issue. Trees filter the air, remove pollution, alleviate heat stress, reduce noise and water pollution, sustain wildlife, result in energy savings and provide higher property values for citizens. Please do not compare our tree ordinances to other cities, be a leader in this space, it will pay off for future generations.   | The draft UDO proposes a regulation that would require a fee and/or replanting for the removal of a heritage tree which is defined as any healthy, native tree greater than 30 in. diameter at breast height (dbh). We believe this ordinance balances the need for greater tree preservation with the need for flexibility in development. To your second point, tree planting programs are important for growing our tree canopy but are not directly related to the UDO. However, some fees collected by the city as mitigation payments for tree removal in development go toward these tree planting programs. | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 20.14                                      | City Staff should restore the requirement "Preservation of Heritage Tree required unless there is no other reasonable location" (removed from the first draft) and remove the loophole "Specimen trees may be preserved in-lieu of submitting mitigation payment." (added to the second draft) as worded in the UDO 2nd Draft Key Changes Document. The \$1500 removal fee (per Heritage Tree) from the second draft should remain.<br><br>Specifically, all changes on pages 20-18 and 20-19 should be reverted to First Draft version.   | We believe that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow us to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. We will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts | We should not require minimum setbacks. Land is a scarce resource, but fundamental to community prosperity. As we grow and land gets more valuable, let's eliminate land waste. Setback requirements are a forced land waste. If a homeowner owns a large parcel of land and wants to build a house set back from the property boundary, that should be her call. But, we should not require every building to be set back some arbitrary distance from one another. Give property owners the freedom and optionality to build close to the lot line, reserving space for plentiful pedestrian accessibility and a robust street tree canopy, plus entryway prominence. Reduced or eliminated setbacks also allow for: low-maintenance living by reducing front lawn care requirements (good for seniors and those without the means to spend weekends gardening), greater pedestrian accessibility, traffic-calming, more dwelling units, a "living room" feel in our streetscape. If Baxter Village in Fort Mill can do it, why wouldn't this be allowed absolutely everywhere in a growing international city and urban center like within Charlotte city limits? | Building setbacks for N1-A through N1-D are designed to insure compatibility with existing neighborhoods. N1-E would permit the form of development you have referenced.  | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 4.3 (H)(2)b                                | Leave text for steep grade and associated flexibility required on sloping sites.   | With the removal of language stating that all other ground floor entrances shall be between four feet above and four feet below the sidewalk grade, staff does not believe the text related to steep slope is needed.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 5.3 (C)          | setbacks should range from 20-30 feet in all locations for N2, in addition open space should be allowed to count between building and back of sidewalk with correct design (or allow similar to TOD enhanced streetscape to count for a portion of public open space) reduce N2-A Primary/Secondary to 20' and 16'.  | N2 setbacks do generally range from 20-30 feet in the second draft UDO with a few exceptions (e.g. Linear Park (Uptown) and Parkway). Parkway will be changed to 20'.<br><br>Required public open space may be located adjacent to a sidewalk (Table 16-2).<br><br>Staff will revise the setback for Other- Primary and Secondary for N2-A from 24' to 20' but does not recommend setbacks of 16' for N-2A because of the intent of the district. | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 7.1              | RC-1 only appears to accommodate development in a area of charlotte of such as URP; but with many other 'private' properties around charlotte (morehead, elizabeth, etc) that could see development of single use office, or multi-family as has occurred previously around the hospital. the flexibility for these uses don't appear to exist in the campus zoning districts as written or in the table of uses.  | Campus uses are found in the Use Definitions in Article 15.3. They are not called out individually in the Use Matrix.<br><br>RC-1 is designed to provide the flexibility referenced by the comment.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 7.3(B)           | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for IC-2 and RC-1 are between 20-30 feet for all frontages except Parkways and (Uptown) Linear Park. Parkway will be changed to 20'. For IC-1 and OFC, an option to reduce parking will be added when no parking or maneuvering is provided between a building and the street.<br><br>See response above on open space.  | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 7.3(D)           | main street ground floor residential height in suburban districts should be 12', not 16'. this is only applicable in urban districts. in addition, residential is not even a primary or allowed use in campus or OFC.  | Minimum ground floor residential height in all Campus districts is 12' with the exception of development on a Main Street frontage, which would be a very infrequent occurrence.<br><br>Residential uses are allowed in certain Campus types, particularly when the residential supports the campus use(s).   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 8.3(B)           | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Staff believes that the proposed setbacks for ML-1 and ML-2 are appropriate in light of the character of the uses in these districts. They are generally consistent with the effective setbacks in the current zoning ordinance.<br><br>See response above on open space.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 9.3(A)           | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for IMU are between 20-30 feet for all frontages except Linear Park (Uptown) and Parkway. The Parkway setbackd will be reduced to 20'. For IC-1 and OFC, an option to reduce parking will be added when no parking or maneuvering is provided between a building and the street.<br><br>See response above on open space.  | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 9.3(C)           | main street ground floor residential height in suburban districts should be 12', not 16'. this is only applicable in urban districts. in addition, residential is not even a primary or allowed use in campus or OFC.  | Minimum ground floor residential height in the IMU district is 12' with the exception of development on a Main Street frontage, which would be a very infrequent occurrence. The IMU district is not intended as a "suburban" district.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 10.3(A)          | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for NC are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'.<br><br>See above for open space response.  | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 11.3(A)          | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for CAC-1 and CAC-2 are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'.<br><br>See above for open space response.  | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 12.3(A)          | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for Regional Activity Center districts are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'.<br><br>See above for open space response.   | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 13.3(A)          | setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above. | Setbacks for TOD districts are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'.<br><br>See above for open space response.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 4-13        | page 4-13 Voluntary Mixed-Income Development #4.d needs exception for dispersion of units if less than 5 units total provided. Suggest it reads: "d. Affordable housing units provided as a component of the voluntary mixed-income residential development shall be distributed throughout the development, not concentrated in any one structure or area of the site, unless the total Affordable Housing Units in the development is 5 or less."<br><br>[explanation is one building of 5 townhomes can not be dispersed; but the 5 units is still important]"  | Change will be made.   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 5-6 and 5-7 | p5-6 sec E and 5-7 chart note 3. passage way requirements through the building are not legal for TH in N2-C. Note 3 on page 5-7 needs to exclude townhomes on sublots. Section G. Min Ground floor can not be required on TH (duplex, tri, quad, SF). As there is no definition of passage or passageway they meet the definition of Breezeway which causes conflicts with Articulation standards in section 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12,13  | Footnote 3 regarding passageways only applies if development in the N2-C district wishes to exceed the 400' maximum building length with additional design elements.<br><br>The criteria for the passageway provide the clarity needed. A passageway is a common term that is different from a breezeway.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 14-15       | pg 14-15+ Cottage Court Overlay: it's a good concept but the diagrams on page 14-16 and the addition of the sentence in #3 about emergency access don't sync. The drawing needs to show parking and access. It would also be more helpful to write a more complete sentence which tells us specifically how many feet to a fire hydrant each building need be.   | Thank you for these comments. We will revise the diagrams in the next draft.   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 14-7        | 14.2 page 14-7 addition of Streetside Historic District must include the requirements of General Statute 160D including 160D-944 which has requirements for investigations & analysis, and public hearings.  | The requirements of 160D are already included in Section 14.2.B.2 which states that the designation procedures of 14.1.C through 14.1.L govern the administration of the HDO-S.  | No                       |
| 6/28/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Articles 3-5     | Hi- In regards to Articles 3, 4 & 5. I'm very confused as to how we, the general public, are to know which new zoning district we are in (neighborhood 1 or 2). Without that knowledge, how are we to know what comments we may want to make. There's no maps attached anywhere and the so called zoning maps on the City of Charlotte website show nothing. I think it's ridiculous to call this "community input" if we don't have all the information to give input on. This is very frustrating.   | The translation table on page 3-1 indicates the current zoning district and the new UDO district. The zoning for a conventionally zoned property will translate to the applicable new UDO zoning district on the effective date of the UDO. The current zoning of a property can be found on Charlotte Explorer and the translation map is located on the UDO website. | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page   | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 3.2  | Translation of existing zoning districts to new UDO districts<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unclear from the information provided how the following districts and/or existing entitlements in the URP and UCP translate to new districts:</li> <li>There is no guidance provided in the UDO to understand how and where the CAC-1 and CAC-2 districts will be appropriately used.</li> <li>There does not appear to be a translation or rationale on how and where MUDD would translate to CAC-1. The intent statement of CAC-1 would suggest that its use in the UCP area would be appropriate.</li> </ul>  | Zoning translation to new UDO districts will occur for conventionally zoned properties on the effective date of the UDO per Section 3.2. Criteria for application of CAC-1 and CAC-2 districts will be determined during the alignment zoning process. Per Section 3.2, properties with conventional MUDD zoning will translate to CAC-2.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 3.2  | Current zoning district translation and direction on appropriate locations where IMU is to be used appears to be absent.   | None of the current zoning districts will translate to IMU. This district will be appropriate for properties with an IMU Place Type designation on the Policy Map.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Building Design & Material Standards) | Building Design & Material Standards:<br>Façade Modulation For non-residential and mixed use buildings should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions.<br>For buildings 150' in length or longer, facades located along a frontage shall be divided into shorter segments by means of modulation. Such modulation shall occur at intervals of no more than 100' and shall be no less than 1' in depth and 20' in length. Modulation is not required for those portions of the façade located higher than the first story. Special consideration shall be given to Architectural Styles that use alternate design details to achieve the same goal.   | Staff believes that facade modulation is more appropriate for residential development and has retained modulation standards for residential but believes that modulation is not appropriate for non-residential and mixed-use in all circumstances and does not recommend adding this standard.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Building Design & Material Standards) | Base and Entrance Design Standards should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions:<br>For buildings four stories or more, the first floor above street grade shall be significantly distinguished from the remainder of the building with an emphasis on providing design elements that will enhance the pedestrian environment. Buildings shall be designed with at least three elements to add special interest to the base, including but not limited to cornices, corbeling, molding, stringcourses, ornamentation, changes in material or color, recessing, architectural lighting, and other sculpturing. Special consideration shall be given to Architectural Styles that use alternate design details to achieve the same goal. | Base of building standards will be added to the next draft of the UDO. The updated standard is similar to what is recommended.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Base and Entrance Design Standards)   | Base and Entrance Design Standards should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions:<br>The use of EIFS should be restricted to building stories above ground level.   | Staff will make this change for multi-family development.   | Yes                      |
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 4.3.B.   | Minimum lot standards in N1 zoning districts are too high to allow for the quantity of attainable housing that is needed in Charlotte. In modifying existing zoning districts in the UDO, the City should allow for smaller lot sizes and significantly greater flexibility in site design. Greenfield developments should be permitted a by-right 50% reduction in lot sizes (effectively instituting the Conservation option by-right) and widths to maximize the residential utility of what little undeveloped land remains in the City of Charlotte.  | Charlotte has many established neighborhoods, and the minimum lot standards recognize that the UDO zoning districts will be applied to these neighborhoods. The lower intensity residential districts are designed to support retention of the character of these neighborhoods. There are some districts with small lots that provide residential zoning options. Also, the Conservation option is allowed by-right. | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 4.5.A.   | The Conservation Development Option should be rewritten as a performance-based tool with unlimited flexibility in lot size, lot dimension and site design, based on a sliding scale of open space preservation. This will allow for maximum product innovation and residential clustering on topographically challenging sites, while substantively moving the needle on housing attainability.  | Staff believes the current approach provides significant site design flexibility while meeting environmental objectives and does not recommend changing at this point.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Building H                            | Building Height - (2): most screening elements around roof top equipment is higher than 5'. for example high rise projects with cooling towers and HVAC equipment can require up to 20' parapet for screening. recommend removing the 5' cap and each project needs to prove the parapet is used for screening of equipment  | Staff believes that screening beyond 5' should be considered in determining the height of the building because of the visual impact.  | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 14.3.D.1 | Article 14.3.D.1 -Please add restrictions on street-facing garages and minimum front porch/entry requirements to the allowable standards as it pertains to the Streetside Historic District Neighborhood Character Overlay Standards  | These types of restrictions would be handled through the design guidelines for streetside historic districts. State law does not allow these restrictions for single-family homes and duplexes in the Neighborhood Character Overlay per 160D-702 which states the circumstances when these standards can be used and includes historic districts.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4        | Article 4 - The height transition was reduced from 65' to 50' for new builds adjacent to residences, but this should be reduced to a maximum of 3 stories (or 40'). Historical neighborhoods have many single-family homes that are only one story high and so a 40' maximum next to single family residences would be a more appropriate transition into a neighborhood setting.   | The first draft UDO would have allowed 65' within the first 200 feet adjacent to a Neighborhood 1, which was reduced in the second draft to 50' within 100 feet of a Neighborhood 1 to address concerns expressed by some neighborhoods. We do not support further decreasing this to 40'.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 4        | Do not pass this. Keep R3 zoning. If you do pass this increase/create green space requirements that increase along with density of duplex / triplex / quadraplex.   | The residential zoning districts in the UDO have been developed to be able to implement the adopted policies of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Such adopted policies include the elimination of single-family only zoning and allowing a duplex or triplex on any lot that a single-family dwelling could be built on.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 6        | Article 6, "Commercial Zoning Districts" should be renamed to "Auto-Oriented Commercial Zoning Districts" Charlotte has a significant problem with cars that we need to overcome. Lets not hide from this.  | Staff believes the name of the district is appropriate because it aligns with the Place Type name.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 3.3.J            | 3.3.J - What is the point of breaking these apart? You talk in this chapter as if these are different districts with different codes but then you get into the nuts and bolts of the document and leave so many opportunities to define these as different ideas only to white wash something across the board as the same. Prominent entrances, all at 250'. Why is that the same right off of a light rail stop where we are trying to promote walking environments as it is all the way out in suburban parkway? We want mixed use and smaller pedestrian oriented spaces in our Urban Cores. Let them have it all day in suburbia in the land of cars, but why make it more stricter where we want people feel safe to walk around?   | The four distinct TOD districts have different development standards and different purposes and location applicability, as outlined in Article 13.1.<br><br>The increase in spacing of prominent entrances to 250' does not intrinsically diminish the pedestrian environment. The UDO's development and design standards for streetscape elements, setbacks, built-to zones, building articulation, blank walls, minimum ground floor height, etc. all contribute to walkability in urban places. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Page 4-6         | page 4-6 chart under E contains Articulation requirement of 150' max for Townhomes in violation of NC GS 160D-702. "Articulation" in Websters dictionary is the act of giving expression and is used 41 times in UDO (though not defined) to mean aesthetic appearance. "Bulk" can be regulated in 160D-702. Websters dictionary says Bulk is "not divided into parts or packaged in separate units", but there is no authority for municipalities to regulate the size of a single-family dwellings even with the reference to "bulk." City cannot dictate the maximum length of a building if the lot size (setbacks, buffers, and such) is large enough.<br>Same aesthetic articulation standards on chart page 5-6 (line B)<br>see also page 15-34 for a correction necessary there | Per 160D-702(a), zoning regulations "...may regulate and restrict the height, number of stories, and size of buildings and other structures..." There are exceptions in subsections (b) and (c) but none apply to townhouses. Staff believes 160D does not preclude the regulation of the length of a townhome building, as it would fall into the category of "size".   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 14.3             | 14.3. The Neighborhood Character Overlay has the potential to significantly undermine the City's goal of expanding housing access by giving neighborhood groups the tools to create restrictive designations in the name of preserving neighborhood 'character'. This overlay should be struck from the UDO.  | Staff believes it is important to expand housing options with increased dwelling units while maintaining current neighborhood character in existing neighborhoods. Staff believes the NCO supports these goals.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 14.1             | 14.4. The Residential Infill Overlay has the potential to significantly undermine the City's goal of expanding housing access by giving neighborhood groups the tools to limit the size and height of new homes in the name of preserving neighborhood 'character'. This overlay should be struck from the UDO.   | Staff believes it is important to expand housing options with increased dwelling units while maintaining current neighborhood character in existing neighborhoods. Staff believes the RIO supports these goals.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page            | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 14.5                        | 14.5. The Cottage Court Overlay District is a worthwhile effort to allow for the construction of affordable cluster homes on smaller lots, but the ordinance as written is far too restrictive. The unit count should be much higher (100 - 120 lots) and the requirement that every home abut greenspace will undermine its value in expanding the city's supply of diverse housing at all price points.  | The definition of a cottage court is a small scale residential development clustered around a common green or open space. Staff believes the proposed Cottage Court Overlay accomplishes this objective.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 3                   | I have concerns with the appropriateness/possible inconsistencies/errors in translation of existing zoning districts (& permitted uses) into new UDO districts and in the new UDO use matrix.<br><br>-A major but under the radar feature of the UDO is the translation of current zoning ordinance districts into new UDO districts. There are several concerns (and could be more) that existing permitted uses under current conventional zoning districts may become non-conforming upon translation into a new UDO district (e.g. medical/hospital uses in existence now under O-1 appear to be non-conforming under OFC, possible B-2 uses non-conforming under new CG).<br>-Similar questions arise regarding the Global Use Matrix of Article 15 and appropriateness of uses/consistency with other UDO provisions.<br>- The UDO is complex so it is understandable that changes will be needed so items like these should reviewed further prior to adoption and between adoption and effective date. | Staff is developing a process to sponsor rezonings for properties that are not aligned with their Place Type and for which non-conformities have been created.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 7                   | The draft UDO continues to limit the location of residential uses in some new districts (e.g. new Campus Districts, OFC districts, & possibly others..<br>Housing affordability, creation of 10 minute neighborhoods and other 2040 goals are served by greater flexibility in location of housing near jobs and services, not less. (Part I)  | Some campus districts allow particular residential uses, typically those that support or are in conjunction with the campus use. Staff does not believe that all zoning districts are appropriate for any type of residential use. Other examples would be Manufacturing and Logistics and Commercial place types. The uses allowed, including residential uses, are based on the use approach from the applicable Place Type. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 7                   | Housing currently allowed in existing ordinance districts appears to be more limited in new UDO districts such as OFC, Campus, among others. Further review is needed to ensure greater housing availability not less. (Part II)   | Some campus districts allow particular residential uses, typically those that support or are in conjunction with the campus use. Staff does not believe that all zoning districts are appropriate for any type of residential use. Other examples would be Manufacturing and Logistics and Commercial place types. The uses allowed, including residential uses, are based on the use approach from the applicable Place Type. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Article 7                   | Along these lines the New RC-1 zoning district appears tailored only for URP. Campus place types exist in a significant portion of the city. If a property has a place type for Campus along Randolph, Elizabeth, Morehead, Whitehall, URP.....and would like to build a stand-alone residential project for example; the definition does not appear to support those uses and is intended for support of a research campus. (Part III)  | Stand-alone residential projects will be allowed in the RC-1 district and the next draft will be updated to clarify this.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Setback) | There should be no setbacks in any district that are greater than 30'; remember this is from future back of curb so many times this is 40'-45' from existing back of curb on our major thoroughfares, and in the future these thoroughfares will have bike lanes separating traffic from the streetscape further buffering the pedestrians and adjacent development. (Part I)  | Changes to setbacks will be made so that 1) setbacks are no greater than 30, or 2) in some cases where setbacks are greater than 30', the setback can be reduced if there is no parking or maneuvering between a building and the street. The only districts with setbacks greater than 30' with no reduction option will be ML-1 and ML-2.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Setback) | Urban / Hybrid districts, max setback for 6+ lane Blvd should be 24' which provides min. 16' streetscape and 8' transition amenity zone. (Part II)   | Setback will be changed to 24'   | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                                       | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Setback)                            | Parkway setback should be reduced to 30', again what is the goal of a setback this large? (Part III)  | The parkway setback will be reduced to 20' for all zoning districts.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Setback)                            | Suburban district setbacks should be reduced to between 20' – 30' depending on road type (Part IIII)  | Staff will make adjustments to some of the setbacks in the second draft.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | Multiple Articles (Setback)                            | Changing setbacks is the easiest way for staff to allow more density and offset other impacts of the UDO, without compromising ANY of the goals of the UDO or 2040 plan (Part V)  | Staff will make adjustments to some of the setbacks in the second draft.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 14.2   | We are excited to see the new Streetside Historic District (Article 14) as we agree that the "restoration, preservation, rehabilitation, and conservation of historically, architecturally, and archaeologically significant areas" are a part of the City's heritage, and therefore should be protected.   | Thank you for your comments.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part II. Zoning Introduction through Part VI. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts | 14.3.D.1   | We encourage the City to please add restrictions on street-facing garages and minimum front porch/entry requirements to the allowable standards as it pertains to the Streetside Historic District Neighborhood Character Overlay Standards (Article 14.3.D.1). This will allow neighborhoods, such as NoDa, to retain their historic architectural features as our district grows.   | These types of restrictions would be handled through the design guidelines for streetside historic districts. State law does not allow these restrictions for single-family homes and duplexes in the Neighborhood Character Overlay per 160D-702 which states the circumstances when these standards can be used and includes historic districts.   | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards                       | Table 20-3: Required Landscape Yard by Zoning District | On page 20-11, Table 20-3 does not require any landscape yards for TOD districts (and many others) unless abutting Neighborhood 1 or 2 Place Types. This should be changed to require at least some kind of landscape yard when abutting ANY residential use. My existing townhouse community (which was built before the 2040 policy map was approved) is not in a Neighborhood 1 or 2 Place Type but abuts a TOD-UC parcel and the current draft of the UDO affords us no protection from a developer building a tower right on their property line with zero buffering between it and our community.   | TOD-zoned properties are typically located in transit station areas, which are intended to have high-density development to take advantage of proximity to nearby rapid transit. Within these areas, landscape yards are not required. The standards in the draft UDO are consistent with the TOD standards currently in place. In addition to the UDO, Building Code will limit the proximity of buildings to each other.   | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards                       | 15.6 Accessory Uses: Prescribed Conditions             | Page 15-54 "C. Dwelling Accessory (ADU) 7. An ADU located within an accessory structure shall comply with the following additional requirements:<br>a. The ADU shall have a total floor area no greater than 50% of the total floor area of the principal residential use."<br>Comment: I would like to see this changed to allow owners of principal dwellings with less than 1000 square feet to be able to build a 500 square foot ADU. For example, say a resident owns a home with 730 square feet and would like to build an ADU. The current language would only allow for the ADU to be a maximum of 365 square feet. With such little square feet, that ADU would not be able to have a dedicated bedroom. At 365 square feet, the ADU may be better served as an AIRBNB/short-term rental. Allowing up to a 500 square feet detached ADU for owners with less than 1000 square feet in their principal dwelling would make room for a one bedroom dwelling which, in turn, can be more likely utilized as a long-term rental serving Charlotte residents. | The approach to ADUs in the draft UDO is different than the regulatory language for ADUs in the current Zoning Ordinance. For example, ADUs will now be allowed on properties with duplex development so long as the dwelling units are not on their own sublots; the square footage allowance has been adjusted; the setback requirements have been relaxed.<br><br>It is the city's desire that this improves the ability for the construction of ADUs. However, staff will continue to evaluate the effects of these adjustments going forward to determine if they have the desired result or if there are additional opportunities for adjustments to further spur ADU development to help mitigate affordability issues and dwelling unit needs throughout the city. | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards                       | 15.3 Use Definitions                                   | In Article 15.3 under definitions it states under Marina, Commercial that by definition a yacht club is considered a commercial marina. In the case of Catawba Yacht Club, that is not true. There are no commercial activities occurring at the Catawba Yacht Club. There are no sales of fuel. Repairs are done by individuals for themselves or helping others in the club. Catawba Yacht Club fits better under the definition of Private Recreation Club. That being said there is no restaurant or bar or other type of commercial activity.  | The word "Commercial" will be removed and the use will be called "Marina". Commercial activities and fuel sales may be allowed but are not a requirement.  | Yes                      |

| Date     | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                           | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/4/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.4 Principal Uses: Prescribed Conditions | <p>15.4.XXX Restaurant/Bar (p 15-44) In your staff response to restaurant questions during the first comment period of the UDO it was stated that "we do not believe restaurants need to be separated from residential areas" and "the current draft UDO language does have some provisions to protect residential areas."</p> <p>I believe that restaurants need some separation from residential zoning. As a 25+ year resident of Dilworth, there are many restaurants along East Boulevard that back up directly to single family residential areas. Adjacent property owners have to not only contend with the noise from entertainment and patrons but also the noise from garbage being put out after close, dumpsters being emptied at 5am, restaurant patrons blocking driveways, vermin on the property due to poor cleanliness, delivery trucks blocking small neighborhood streets, etc. Of course, there are city ordinances to limit this "bad behavior" by restaurants but we have had neighbors fight to have these ordinances enforced for years without improvement. I believe that some minimal separation requirements will prevent these two potentially conflicting zoning uses from having to exist in such close proximity and encourage restaurants to utilize other better suited existing properties in our neighborhood.</p> <p>While there are very limited restrictions in the current UDO for "live/recorded music" outside of the restaurant/bar between the hours of 11p and 6a there is nothing to prevent an outdoor serving of food and alcohol on a patio or rooftop directly adjacent to a Neighborhood 1 Zoning with no separation requirements at any hour of the day. At least the current zoning has a 100' separation distance from the nearest point of an outdoor seating area of a Type II EDEE (Bar) to the nearest property line of a residential use lot or a class A buffer. I guess that I am failing to see the staff logic that a group of people eating and drinking outside after 11pm would not require any separation from a residential property. It seems to me that they would provide the same amount of noise as "recorded music" - if not more. Please consider adding a separation requirement for "outdoor seating" to the UDO to prevent this noise directly adjacent to a neighborhood zoning during the hours of 11p-6a.</p> | <p>Article 15.6 of the draft UDO, which covers the Prescribed Conditions for Accessory Uses, in Paragraph H.2, states:<br/>If at any time between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., food and/or beverages are consumed in an outdoor seating/activity area, it shall meet the following:<br/>a. The outdoor seating/activity area shall be separated by a distance of at least 100 feet from a lot line of any property located in the Neighborhood 1 Place Type.<br/>b. Distances are measured from the closest edge of any outdoor seating/activity area to the nearest lot line of property located in a Neighborhood 1 Place Type.</p> <p>Reference page 15-56 of the second draft UDO. This should address the concerns expressed in this comment.</p> | No                       |
| 6/6/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 16-1: Bonus Menu                     | <p>16-4 For affordable housing, relax the heritage tree ordinance so that fees are not charged for LIHTC projects serving families/seniors with AMI averaging 60% or less. Instead of fees, it would be helpful to have a replanting requirement on-site or even in another agreed upon location.</p> <p>For ease of understanding, separate the bonus calculation for LIHTC projects and/or projects supported by Housing Trust Fund from those with smaller percentages of sq. ft. devoted to affordable units or higher AMI and offer these the most bonuses in all categories: trees, set-backs, open space, etc. Allow a height bonus of 1 floor in N2B neighborhoods for these projects.</p>   | <p>The draft includes a provision for affordable housing to plant trees on-site instead of paying a fee for heritage tree removal. Affordable housing projects that meet affordability criteria will receive double credit for tree planting.</p> <p>Staff does not recommend making changes to the bonus table at this time but will monitor the effectiveness of the bonus approach for affordable housing and continue to work with the affordable housing development community to consider changes in the future.</p>   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                           | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/7/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.4 Principal Uses: Prescribed Conditions | <p>"Section 15 .4.L.4 &amp; 5 - Bed and Breakfast restrictions. Why would you not allow B &amp; B's to use detached structures (ADU's) as available rooms to rent also?</p> <p>Section 15.C Maximum height for ADU's are limited to the height of the principle structure. This is very limiting if you currently have an older one story ranch with a low pitch roof and 8' ceilings. The peak of the ridge may be only 12' off the ground. A new ADU with a minimum crawl, 9' ceiling and 6/12 pitch roof will be taller than that. I suggest a maximum of 15' - 16' in height or no taller than the principle residence, whichever is greater. Otherwise, you effectively prevent it from working for some people.</p> <p>Section 15 limits ADU SF to 50% of the principle structure first floor. If you have a small principle structure, say 1,000 SF, you should still be able to build a reasonably sized ADU. Why not make it a maximum of 50% of the principle structure or 800 SF, whichever is greater?"</p> | <p>Staff believes the separate language governing the uses of B&amp;B and ADUs are appropriate. An obstacle, by definition and nature, is that B&amp;B rooms are not complete dwelling units housing their own cooking and sanitary facilities. However, ADUs, by definition and nature, are complete dwelling units housing their own cooking and sanitary facilities. To allow B&amp;Bs in ADUs blends the uses and their requirements which becomes difficult to differentiate, administer, and enforce.</p> <p>The approach to ADUs in the draft UDO is different than the regulatory language for ADUs in the current Zoning Ordinance. For example, ADUs will now be allowed on properties with duplex development so long as the dwelling units are not on their own sublots; the square footage allowance has been adjusted; the setback requirements have been relaxed.</p> <p>It is the city's desire that this improves the ability for the construction of ADUs. However, staff will continue to evaluate the effects of these adjustments going forward to determine if they have the desired result or if there are additional opportunities for adjustments to further spur ADU development to help mitigate affordability issues and dwelling unit needs throughout the city.</p> | No                       |
| 6/10/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1 Vehicle Parking Requirements    | <p>I strongly disagree with allowing developments with no parking requirements. our town is not set up for a no car future and we travel and go shopping with cars. I live in the South End area and the parking lots at brewery's or the grocery store are always very full. Yes a few may be able to ride the light rail to work if your office is close to the line. That's the only reason for no parking requirements. what about the 10 reasons why they should have parking, shopping, travel, visitors, emergencies, kids, doctor visits, dinners out, work, Ect. Only a very small percentage can live without a car. Every unit should be required at least 1 parking space. What I have found so far is that the few building without any parking are using all of the street parking. This leaves no parking for other visitors or guess.</p>   | <p>While the UDO does not require parking, in most cases, for Charlotte's most urban and multi-modal areas, the UDO does not disallow the inclusion of parking in these developments, consistent with market demand. The UDO parking standards for these urban areas implement the related policies in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/8/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14 Heritage Trees                       | <p>20.14 Heritage Trees</p> <p>The original writing of this section intended to preserve Charlotte's treasured trees as they provide a greater benefit to the community over the smaller caliper trees. Larger, more mature trees offset carbon production more efficiently and effectively than the smaller, commonly planted trees from development. It is disappointing to see the large tree canopy that once covered Charlotte be graded and destroyed by each new development. When reviewing construction documents, building a site plan should be designed around tree save areas, heritage trees, and natural areas. The removal of heritage trees should be met with force from City staff, city council, and the taxpayers of this City.</p>  | <p>Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/8/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.17 Tree Planting Requirements           | <p>The internal planting areas for each tier are minimal and should far exceed the required 10% of the total built upon area.</p>   | <p>The UDO staff will not be increasing the internal tree planting standard beyond the required 10% of BUA and one tree per every 10,000 sq ft of BUA that is carried over from current requirements. Staff does not feel there is adequate policy foundation for altering this standard in this draft of the UDO.</p>  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page         | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/9/2022  | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14 Heritage Trees     | The change to article 20.14 on Heritage trees must be reverted back to the original requirements stated in Draft 1 OR the fee associated with removing a healthy heritage tree must be significantly higher in order to deter people from removing these trees. Removal and replacement does not have nearly the same ecological, health, economic, and communal benefits that preserving large trees has. This change is simply an "easy way out" for developers and homeowners to wipe out historic trees piece by piece. Some may say the \$1500 fee associated with the permit will deter people from removing these trees. However, the removal cost alone for a large tree is thousands of dollars. If a homeowner/developer can pay to remove a healthy heritage tree, the "fee" is a drop in the bucket for them. There is NOT tree protection legislation when there is no "protection" component.  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/11/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.2 Landscape Plantings | Section 20.2 mentions only planting plants on the "approved species list," which sounds great except that there are invasive species on this approved list. Lacebark elm, Chinese pistache, and more are incredibly invasive (see the wall of lacebark that has taken over the floodplain on the midtown greenway). Same for the shrubs, and the approved species list doesn't even mention flowers, ferns, grasses, sedges, or vines. There are several wonderfully hearty native species not even mentioned on the list, yet it's about half non-natives or nursery varieties. I would love to see a complete ban on species not native to the North American continent. We've seen what invasive species can do to our environment (kudzu, Bradford pear, English ivy, etc). Why continue to roll the dice with nonnative plants when there are SO many gorgeous natives. What about American wild olive, long leaf pine, gray dogwood, red chokeberry, big leaf magnolia, catalpas, dwarf sables, yaupon, sweet bay magnolia, pond cypress, green hawthorn, parsley hawthorn, box elder, hackberry, cottonwood, the list goes on). I do know that some of our natives have been plagued by disease (introduced from nonnative sources ironically), but I would love to see a serious priority on reintroducing natives to the landscape as much as possible. | Staff will be revising the approved species list as a part of an update to the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual before the effective date of the UDO.   | No                       |
| 6/13/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.6                     | I am writing to request a change to the sections on height requirements for auxiliary buildings in the R-4 / N1-B residential zones. We would like to build a 2 story garage with a small apartment over it, but are currently prevented because we have a short, one story 1956 brick ranch. It creates a situation where we can't build the 2 story garage unless we add a 2nd story to our house and if we add a second story to the house, we can't afford the 2 story garage. Being able to build a 2nd story on the garage would allow us space for an office or guest space.<br><br>This would be allowed if some of the original recommendations from Oct 2020 were adopted. The recommendation indicated that the UDO should be simplified when referencing auxiliary building size and height. The recommendation suggested: "Align Accessory Structure and ADU code by reducing rear lot setback from 15 feet to 5 feet and providing a set height limit of 24 feet (except in historic districts)"   | The approach to ADUs in the draft UDO is different than the regulatory language for ADUs in the current Zoning Ordinance. For example, ADUs will now be allowed on properties with duplex development so long as the dwelling units are not on their own sublots; the square footage allowance has been adjusted; the setback requirements have been relaxed.<br><br>It is the city's desire that this improves the ability for the construction of ADUs. However, staff will continue to evaluate the effects of these adjustments going forward to determine if they have the desired result or if there are additional opportunities for adjustments to further spur ADU development to help mitigate affordability issues and dwelling unit needs throughout the city. | No                       |
| 6/13/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.5.A.4                 | Is the reference to "dedicated street rights of way" intended to refer only to "dedicated public streets" or is it intended to refer also to "private" streets required to meet the subdivision ordinance pursuant to a rezoning?"   | The intent is traffic bearing streets designed to meet subdivision requirements are not area eligible to calculate toward required open space standards.   | No                       |
| 6/13/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 16-2               | Open space shall abut a frontage -- is it fair to interpret this to mean that open space cannot abut an internal/private street required under a rezoning?   | A network required private street would be considered a frontage.  | No                       |
| 6/13/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.15.K                  | Does the second sentence mean that no pruning of these trees is allowed except where City Code requires pruning of the trees? Trees need to be pruned to stay healthy, so what are the circumstances under which Code requires trees to be pruned? ""Pruning of these trees may be allowed where a tree work permit has been issued **AND ** another requirement of the UDO or City Code requires pruning of these trees."   | This provision will be edited to allow sites to prune trees with a city issued tree work permit without a code requirement to prune the tree.  | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | <p>Article 15, Use Regulations, Part VII RRR.Quarry Item #6, page 15-42 as written: "6. Except in cases of emergency involving safety on the site, quarries may not be operated on Sunday, and may not operate earlier than 7:00 a.m. or later than 6:00 p.m. on any other day. This restriction does not apply to maintenance operations conducted within an enclosed building. "</p> <p>Comment 1: Maintenance should be allowed after operating hours if the operation is in an industrially zoned district or in the case of non-conforming operations, if the decibel level is reasonable at the property line to adjacent residentially zoned parcels.</p>  | The proposed Prescribed Condition that restricts operations and outdoor maintenance will be removed to allow 24/7 operations and outdoor maintenance. However, a prohibition on blasting on Sundays and between 7:00 pm and 7:00 am will be added to the Prescribed Conditions for Quarries.  | Yes                      |
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | <p>Article 15, Use Regulations, Part VII RRR.Quarry Item #6, page 15-42 as written: "6. Except in cases of emergency involving safety on the site, quarries may not be operated on Sunday, and may not operate earlier than 7:00 a.m. or later than 6:00 p.m. on any other day. This restriction does not apply to maintenance operations conducted within an enclosed building. "</p> <p>Comment 2: Operating hours should be allowed to change should DOT projects require shipment for night work or emergencies.</p>  | See above response  | Yes                      |
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Currently Quarries are allowed in I-2 zoning districts provided site conditions are met with Engineering & Property Management. The proposed UDO requires a conditional use permit. It seems that the current process is sufficient and adding another layer of the same information in a quasi-judicial manner does not add any more protection, but instead, creates more expense on the applicant and city staff.  | The conditional use permit would only be required for new quarries. It is important that the community can review and comments on the specific plans for the creation of a new quarry within Charlotte's boundaries or ETJ.   | No                       |
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Require developers to keep 25% of the EXISTING trees on property they plan to build on  | The UDO proposes a 15% green area requirement for residential subdivisions and multifamily development. This is a 5% increase from the current standard for single-family residential developments.   | No                       |
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | We must protect our heritage trees. Developers and homeowners tear them down because it is quicker/easier/cheaper for construction. However, we destroy the environment, remove shade and increase energy usage for air conditioning. I believe this makes it far too easy for a developer or homeowner to spend a small amount of money to destroy a 50 year old mature tree and replace it with a small twig that won't provide shade for 30+ years. Developers and homeowners need to work around heritage trees, otherwise our tree canopy and environment will be placed at risk. In addition, I think every developer should work towards a net increase in tree canopy as part of the design to make Charlotte a livable, walkable city.   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |
| 6/16/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | <p>Preserving the tree canopy, specifically mature hardwoods and pine is an environmental justice issue, and this UDO does not go far enough to protecting Charlotte tree canopy. East Charlotte and the Belmont neighborhood are good examples of areas that are negatively impacted by the lack of tree canopy. Summer temperatures in lower income neighborhoods are unmitigated due to the lack of shade. Mature oaks are consistently cut down and replaced by useless crepe myrtle trees, and maybe, but debatably, worse, nothing. The UDO should protect the Charlotte Canopy by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Requiring any tree replacement to be with North Carolina Native trees.</li> <li>2) Imposing steeper fines for mature trees being cut down.</li> <li>3) Disallowing any tree cutting or clearing in a designated tree save area to cover at least 20% of the lot.</li> </ol> | <p>Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.</p> <p>In addition, the UDO proposes a 15% green area requirement for residential subdivisions and multifamily development. This is a 5% increase from the current standard for single-family residential developments.</p> | No                       |
| 6/17/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | I received an email from Trees Charlotte about section 20. In it, it showed mitigation for champion trees that might be removed. I would like to comment that the second draft showing \$1500 is not enough. Developers could easily pay \$1500 per tree probably amounting to very little in regards to the return they would get for the lots and go ahead and remove the trees. We need to have a much higher minimum per tree and a much stronger requirement ideally to not remove the trees.  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page   | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/17/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20         | I would also like to comment on the rail trail because in reading this UDO, I realized that there is a requirement to maintain and replace trees that have died. I walk daily along the path from Carson to Bland St. Along the trail beside the huge Apartment building along the corner of Carson and the rail trail has a high proportion of the trees removed. It is approximately 1/3 of the way of that block along the rail trail. Dogwood trees are planted in this 100 foot walkway and six at least are dead and have been removed and not replaced. In the afternoons when the sun is beating down the few dogwoods remaining provide much needed shade. Can those dogwoods please be replaced that have been dead for over three years? The plantings along here are regularly maintained and I'm not sure why it hasn't been noticed that these trees are missing but it's a great distraction from the beauty of the area to have big gaping holes where the trees used to be. | These trees are not likely code-required trees and any replanting would be conducted by the property owner at their discretion. If this property is city-owned, residents can make a service request by calling 311 or through CLT+ to have these trees replanted.  | No                       |
| 6/17/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20         | Article 20. Please make the trees really, really important. Preserve large trees and plant new ones. Make it really hard for developers to disrespect the trees and the people in the neighborhoods!   | Staff have received and noted your statement. The UDO proposes several changes to better protect these trees from damage and removal.   | No                       |
| 6/20/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15         | In Townhome Communities, the presence of short term rentals can create a situation that invades peoples privacy, parking problems when others come to parties, damages to the properties to the Right and Left of the said short term rental. Also, the Value of the properties to the Right and Left as well as surrounding sets of townhomes, could and would be affected by the presence of Short Term Rentals. Our privacy in small townhome communities is Essential to our Safety and Right to live in a secure setting. Short term rentals would have a detrimental effect on many fronts. Please take these important points into consideration.   | At this time the City Attorney's Office has advised staff to remove language regulating short-term rentals from the draft UDO due to legal uncertainties. If/when the legal and legislative uncertainties surrounding this type of use becomes more clear the City Attorney's Office will work with staff to develop appropriate standards.   | No                       |
| 6/20/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20         | Article 20. Landscape, Screening, & Trees - I think it is important to have tree ordinance so that contractor and home owners can't cut down heritage trees for know good reason. I think if they have to cut done a tree for construction etc. they should have to plant at least 2 trees for every 1 tree remove. I total agree on having to have permits to cut down trees and fines if you don't do so. Thanks   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |
| 6/20/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 19-46. 19.9.C | Long-Term Bicycle Parking: The difference between long term parking and short term parking is far too narrow to be meaningful. Protection from the elements is one part of the equation when it comes to long term bike parking, but the security of the space also plays a role. Especially with the increasing popularity of expensive e-bikes. I recommend either requiring long-term spaces to be secured by some means (either in a controlled access area or by bike lockers) or at least have some percentage of the long term spaces be secured.   | This suggestion would shift the responsibility for bicycle security from the bicycle rider/owner to the property owner. Staff does not support making a change at this time, since most bike riders who leave their bikes parked long-term will have secured them with a lock of some type or will have found a secure location.  | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4               | Affordable Housing Development Allowances, A-2: Is this backwards: "If zoned the N2-C or NC Zoning District, to build to the N2-A or N2-B Zoning District standards" The way this is written is offering you the ability to build less density. Shouldn't it read: If zoned N2-A or N2-B Zoning District standards to build to the N2-C or NC Zoning District.   | The referenced language was developed based on input from affordable housing developers who indicated that the more intense form of development in N2-C frequently is inconsistent with the desired form of development for affordable housing.   | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.9               | Design of Bicycle Parking A4: "Bicycle parking facilities shall provide sufficient security from theft and damage." This statements seems to put liability for stolen & damaged bicycles on the developer. They should not be responsible for preventing criminal acts. I think the points about bike racks being anchored securely and being in a well-lit location are fine.   | (2022-06-22) The new standard in 19.9.A.4 means that the bike parking facility (i.e. the bike rack), not the parked bicycles, shall have security from theft and damage. The second sentence provides additional clarification by saying it must be anchored to the ground and have sufficient lighting and visibility.   | No                       |
| 6/21/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20         | Trying to understand how an N2 multifamily site would apply tree save and open space requirements. If I have a 1 acre lot (43,560sf), I am required to provide 10% open space (4,356sf) and 15% green area/tree save (6,534sf). Fifty percent of my open space can count towards tree save so open space (2,178sf) + open space as tree save (2,178) + remaining tree save (4,356) = 8,712 sf total. Is that correct? Could I potentially lose 20% of developable site area to tree save/open space unless I pay the city a ton in fees?   | There are multiple ways to meet green area and open space requirements. Depending on the site's Place Type and resulting tier, green area requirements can be met through tree save, amenitized tree area, green roof or wall, land donation, off site mitigation, and payment in lieu. Open space can in the open air, under a roof, or on a building roof, balcony, or deck. Open space and some green area credit options can be overlapped as well. Payment in lieu is another option. These options for green area and open space provide opportunities to reduce the amount of development area that is impacted. | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page              | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/22/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15                    | I am not sure if comments about Airbnb belong in this section, but please accept them if not. The Airbnb next-door to me on Leyla Avenue in Wesley Heights is a constant party zone. It's a quiet neighborhood otherwise, but when it is rented out large party spill out onto the street and there's usually some type of drug activity. The music is so loud that I cannot sleep because our houses are very close together. Not to mention the smells I have to endure. There are other Airbnb's in the neighborhood and my neighbors report the same type of activity. Can you please increase penalties For Airbnb landlords who are not on the property and don't see what's happening. They shouldn't have free rain and ruin everybody else's peace. | At this time the City Attorney's Office has advised staff to remove language regulating short-term rentals from the draft UDO due to legal uncertainties. If/when the legal and legislative uncertainties surrounding this type of use becomes more clear, the City Attorney's Office will work with staff to develop appropriate standards.  | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14                         | 20.14 - This does not go far enough in protecting Charlotte's trees. A developer should be required to leave more green space and preserve heritage and larger trees. So many lots are cleared with a few twigs left to represent the "preserved" space. Buildings are out of proportion to the lot size and neighborhood. This cannot be allowed to continue. Our once beautiful city is being destroyed with the clear cutting of lots. Strengthen the fines for ruining the landscape and destroying the trees. This doesn't go far enough in fines or incentives to keep our trees.  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table15-1 and Use Definitions | Still unclarity with campus uses (majority only permitted uses are campus or educational facilities) and those definitions which appear to not support a stand along apartment, residential, office, or retail project.  | Uses are based on the campus type and campus use definitions found in Article 15. The intent of the campus districts is to have uses that relate to the overall intent of the campus type. For example, an educational campus would have offices and residential related to the educational facility. Retail uses would also be related to the educational facility but could also be open to the general public. The RC-1 district will allow stand-alone residential, office, or retail. This will be clarified in the next draft.  | Yes                      |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 16-1: Bonus Menu        | Points too low for 11 & 12 to be utilized; recommend atleast increasing to 2 points. estimates i've seen are around \$25k for a multi-modal mitigation. compared to microbilty lockers for 10 points, i would assume that microbilty lockers would not cost \$125k-\$250k which would equate those two bonus options.  | Staff believes that the proposed points are appropriate. However, staff will monitor the bonus table use and may make recommendations for change in the future.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.5 (A)5                     | clarify what dedicated r/w means? is this proposed r/w to be dedicated at end of construction for new roads? future transit r/w?   | 16.5.A.5 does not reference right-of-way. Please contact staff with an updated reference.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 16.2                    | remove elevation requirements of 24" and indicate it shall be ADA accessible to adjacent sidewalk, and not greater than 48" above grade.   | This is not a requirement to be 24" from grade. This is an standard that an open space can be no more than 24" above or below grade, on average. This does not override any ADA requirements.   | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.15                         | Tier 3 & 4 green area should be combined (in table they are essentially the same) to include only N1, N2-A, parks and preserve. OFC zoning could occur on very small infill lots based on policy map and is closer to a Commercial place type. footnote 1 should be removed, it is not reasonable for the chief urban forester to make a decision without parameters that a project could be built or not. current ordinance allows replanting at 150%.  | While tier 3 and tier 4 are largely similar, there are key differences that require these to remain separate. Among these differences is the fact that some perimeter planting standards apply to tier 3 sites that do not apply to tier 4 sites. Footnote 1 will not be revised in the next draft as this requirement largely mirrors the current standard. The current ordinance allows trees to be planted for mitigation "where the existing tree canopy must be removed due to conflicting design criteria or hardship approved by the city" at 150% for single family subdivision sites and all sites located within a "wedge". The UDO uses different language but maintains that approval from the city must be granted before trees are removed. | No                       |
| 6/23/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.16                         | confirm that ex. ordinance issues for perimeter tree planting calc have been resolved and driveways, utility easement areas, sight triangles, NCDOT sight distance, etc. are now excluded from the overall distance and calc.  | These elements will not be excluded from the calculation of the number of required perimeter trees but flexibility will continue to be granted for where they may be planted.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/24/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.3             | <p>REQUIRED ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS – Page 19-28.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Second Draft of the Charlotte UDO – and for the efforts the planning team is making to incorporate community feedback.</p> <p>ABOUT CHARGEPOINT</p> <p>ChargePoint is a world leading electric vehicle (“EV”) charging network, providing scalable solutions for every charging scenario from home and multifamily to workplace, parking, hospitality, retail, and transport fleets of all types. ChargePoint’s cloud subscription platform and software-defined charging hardware is designed to enable businesses to support drivers, add the latest software features and expand fleet needs with minimal disruption to overall business.</p> <p>19.3 Subsection B</p> <p>EV Capable vs EV Ready: ChargePoint urges the City to retain EV-Ready in lieu of EV-Capable. The cost to add additional breaker capacity and a 240V outlet receptacle or blank cover is a minimal cost at the point of new construction. Adding electrical components and wiring to terminate at the parking location to enable future EV charging would add a couple hundreds of dollars as compared to around \$1000 in electrical work to enable charging infrastructure. See Slide 24 of City of Orlando’s 2019 EV Make Ready Study: <a href="https://www.orlando.gov/files/sharedassets/public/departments/edv/acc-ev-ready-commissioner-briefings_updated.pdf">https://www.orlando.gov/files/sharedassets/public/departments/edv/acc-ev-ready-commissioner-briefings_updated.pdf</a></p> <p>This also would reduce barriers to electrification by the site-host and consumer/resident who seeks access to EV charging.</p> <p>EVSE Installed: ChargePoint supports the specific requirement in Subsection B 2 for amperage. However, the amperage requirement should be at the panel and not at the charger. ChargePoint supports an input requirement of a 40amp breaker that would enable a 32amp EV charging station.</p> | Staff believes that the standards in the current draft are appropriate and does not recommend changes.  | No                       |
| 6/24/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.3             | <p>Outdoor Storage Yard on page 15-22. I2 land makes up 18,389 acres and the average size is 3.6 acres. The new UDO calls for outside storage to be a minimum of 30’ from any lot line. That takes away a lot of productive land for I2 users. And you could have 2 I2 users next to each other with 30’ + 30’ = 60’ of land that cannot be used.</p> <p>Current zoning says side yards must be 0 or 5’ and rear yards must be 10’ (if I am reading the code correctly). If no one has really complained I don’t know why that needs to change so dramatically. We already have the situation covered if next to residential and/or on public right of way.</p> <p>As you know, there is not enough I2 land as it is. I feel this is making it less productive. Happy to discuss if any questions or if my facts are incorrect.</p>   | <p>The 30’ separation will be eliminated where properties zoned ML-1 or ML-2 abut. The limit on stored materials not exceeding the fence/wall height will be changed from 30 feet to 15 feet.</p> <p>The side setback for both ML districts in the Public Hearing Draft UDO is now zero (0’). The rear setback has been changed to 10’ in this draft.</p> | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | <p>p20-36, 20-37, 23-12, 25-13, 27-11</p> <p>Article 20 (p20-36/ 20-37) does NOT have the same language as other articles</p> <p>It should say:</p> <p>7. To designate appropriate other person(s) who shall carry out the powers and duties of the Chief Urban Forester.</p> <p>This sentence is in Article 23 (watershed), 24 (stormwater), 25 (PCSO), 26 (SWIM), (28 ) Erosion)</p> <p>This sentence is not in Article 20 or 27 (floodplain) of 30 (SSI Administrator)”</p>  | This change will be made in the next draft of the UDO.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-22       | <p>Outdoor Storage Yard on page 15-22. I2 land makes up 18,389 acres and the average size is 3.6 acres. The new UDO calls for outside storage to be a minimum of 30’ from any lot line. That takes away a lot of productive land for I2 users. And you could have 2 I2 users next to each other with 30’ + 30’ = 60’ of land that cannot be used.</p> <p>Current zoning says side yards must be 0 or 5’ and rear yards must be 10’ (if I am reading the code correctly). If no one has really complained I don’t know why that needs to change so dramatically. We already have the situation covered if next to residential and/or on public right of way.</p> <p>As you know, there is not enough I2 land as it is. I feel this is making it less productive. Happy to discuss if any questions or if my facts are incorrect.</p>   | See above response.   | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-18       | page 15-18 bona fide farm definition does not fully portray that General Statute 160D-903 exempts bona fide farm use from all of UDO except floodplain. Add a definition in Article 2 to more fully explain the inapplicability of UDO on farm uses   | Staff disagrees. The definition for bona fide farm directly references the applicable general statute and the city does have the ability to regulate bona fide farms depending on where they are geographically located within its sphere of influence.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-29       | page 15-29 Use: Beneficial Fill Site: #6. why is a plat for a Beneficial Fill site not sufficient when it shows the same thing as a survey. The added sentence is redundant   | The beneficial fill site, itself, does not require a recorded plat. The requirement is for the location of a beneficial fill site to be indicated on recorded plats when required by development.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-34       | page 15-34 prescribed conditions on Quads: Regardless of the Zoning category, inclusionary zoning is not authorized by state law so you may not require 1/4 of a quad meet priced for a 80% AMI. Remove note #1 a   | The quadruplex allowance is through the bonus of an affordable housing unit. Without this bonus, a single-family, duplex, or triplex dwelling would be allowed.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-53       | page 15-53, defined p15-25 Temporary Outdoor Sales the addition of #2 under G. Temporary Outdoor Sales makes garage sales not allowed in N1 & N2. How can you not allow garage sales? change the definition on 15-25 to exclude garage sales with permits   | The use definition of Temporary Outdoor Sales is not intended to capture garage sales events at residential properties.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-55       | pg 15-55: home occupation #8<br>How does the definition on page15-20 not also mean all of the people currently working from home? I suggest it needs to differentiate between running a business and working for a business from your home.<br>#1 should read 1. A zoning Customary Home Occupation use permit is required.<br>#8 not allowing an employee to pick up a paycheck or drop off an assignment is absurd when you allow UPS or door dash to do the same. change # 8 so people don't have to cheat. "Only residents of the dwelling may be engaged in work activities at the residence." is sufficient- the last sentence should be deleted  | Staff can explore in the future if making a differentiation between a home location as a principal business location and as a virtual secondary office location is necessary and warranted.<br><br>Reference #1, what is currently a Customary Home Occupation Permit is a type of Zoning Use Permit. It appears such further distinguishment is unnecessary.<br><br>Reference #8, staff feels this language is appropriate as it is designed to protect the residential nature of neighborhoods by keeping home locations from being commercialized as distribution and dispatch hubs. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-1        | page 16-1 A.1. one principal structure per lot<br>Conflicts with page 4-7 #4.3 G-1 (a) which says 2 principal structures in N1-F  | Two principal structures would be allowed on a lot in N1-F consistent with 16.1.A.1.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-10       | page 16-10 noise, vibration, dust, odors<br>Item A. Noise references Municipal code 15 (section 15-63) but item B needs similar reference to allow for grading activities on tracts of land between 7:01 am and 8:59pm (like current Code). Item D- Odors and Fumes can not be applied to the entire ETJ . Language needs to match 160A-193 (c) "The authority granted by this section does not authorize the application of a city ordinance banning or otherwise limiting outdoor burning to persons living within one mile of the city, unless the city provides those persons with either (i) trash and yard waste collection services or (ii) access to solid waste dropoff sites on the same basis as city residents" | The referenced language of Item B matches the existing vibration language of the current Zoning Ordinance found at Section 12.703. Staff is unaware of any referenced current code exemption for grading activities in the Zoning Ordinance or City Code.<br><br>Reference Item D, this Section would only be applied in egregious situations as determined by the Zoning Administrator and/or UDO Administrator.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-9        | page 16-9 section 16.6 A.<br>sidewalk width on a private lot to a private front door is not for public use and is clearly a design element violating 160D-702.<br><br>Change needed is to delete all of # 1 and change # 2 to read:<br>2. All other residential dwellings and developments except townhomes, duplexes, triplexes and quadruplexes: A pedestrian connection, a minimum of five feet in width....."   | Staff does not believe that sidewalk width is a design element as defined by 160D-702.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-9        | page 16-9 dimensions of decks (in the chart) is a design element violating G.S. 160D-702 remove that row or exempt SF, Duplex, triplex, quads and TH's  | Staff does not believe that the dimension of decks is a design element as defined by 160D-702.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 17-1        | page 17-1 zoning use permits for accessory structures<br>17.1 C. requires a Zoning Use permit or a Building permit but that is not correct, because the definition of structure (pg 2-39) would include mailboxes, fences, walls, and electric transformers -- not of which should require a zoning or building permit.<br><br>Either change the definition or the requirement for a Zoning Use Permit  | The current practice of not requiring zoning use permits for mailboxes, fences, walls, etc. will carry forward as practice for administration of the UDO.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 17-3        | page 17-3 fence & wall prohibition in sight triangle was added twice as #B and # h. delete the added # H  | This correction will be made.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 19-47       | page 19-47 Commercial vehicle storage.<br>no large comm vehicles in mixed -use means no schools or public safety in mixed use stored overnight. Needs exceptions to allow firetrucks/school buses and similar vehicles - because Public Transit Facilities and Public Safety facilities are allowed uses in all districts   | For clarity, both public transit facilities and public safety facilities are not allowed in ALL zoning districts.<br><br>Staff feels the current language is appropriate. While it is not impossible that a public transit facility or public safety facility may be a part of a mixed-use development it is more likely they would take the form, due to their operations and security/emergency operational requirements, of standalone nonresidential development. As such, that development and storage of commercial vehicles would then be covered by the allowances of Section 19.11.C. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-1        | page 16-1 cottage court not capitalized in 16.1 A 1 b. and 16.1 B 3   | This is intentional. The references are to the form of development, not the formal zoning overlay district.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-8        | page 16-8 section 16.5 A. 2 says Tree Save doesn't count but # 3 b says 50% counts.<br>eliminate Tree Save in item 2  | Staff will revise this to allow elements that may overlap as specified by this section.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 18-2        | page 18-2<br>section 18-2 C says breezeway has to be to rear or side, pole separation & max height. All conflict with passageway requirements in articles 5,7,9,10,11,12,13. Adding definition of passageway in Article 2 will resolve the conflict   | Staff disagrees. The word passageway occurs once in the draft UDO - in the definition of building length. It therefore seems that the passage requirements referenced are meant to be distinguished from requirements for breezeways.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-10       | page 20-10 fence height<br>Table 20-2 says 6' min / 10' max. in class C but pg 20-5 says 6' min 8' max. Further conflicting with section 17 page 17-4 which says 5, 6', or 8' max<br>needs correction and clarity   | Staff feels the differentiation is appropriate as the heights are standards for different purposes. Table 20-2 regulates fence height for landscape yards. The fence height referenced on page 20-5 regulates fence heights for parking lot screening. The references to Article 17 regulates fence heights for residential properties in Neighborhood 1, Neighborhood 2, and Mobile Home Park Zoning Districts.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-17       | p 20-17, 20-26, 20-20 (twice) Heritage tree applicability, and frontage tree 'subdivision' regs listed says section 31.3 A but it's correctly section 30.3  | Staff will adjust this reference accordingly   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-21       | page 20-21 D. #4 method of calculation<br>title says Tree Save Method for Calculation but Paragraph title says Green Area calculation<br>I believe Green Area is correct title  | Staff will adjust this header to say Green Area Method for Calculation   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-23       | page 20-23 #10 TS overlap<br>I emailed Tim porter and believe that it should be Green Area Overlap not Tree Save  | This is correct as written. This section is only specifying how tree save areas may be overlapped with other open areas. Any green area credit (including tree save) that may be overlapped with other required open areas has a similar section (see amenitized tree area in section 20.15.1.6)   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-24       | page 20-24 H Off-site mitigation<br>acceptable to Chief, a conservation group AND in compliance? All 3? Or one of the three? I believe it is # 1 or 2 and # 3. change # 1 to say "Approved by the Chief Urban Forester or acceptable to a land conservation group listed in the Charlotte Tree Manual." and change #3 to #2 | This standard will be revised to allow land used for off-site mitigation to be conveyed or protected if land is approved by the Chief Urban Forester and in compliance with the Charlotte Tree Manual.   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-25       | page 20-25 I. #3 gravel paths<br>gravel paths are pervious per state law. Change definition pg 2-21   | Per this standard, gravel pathways in amenitized tree areas will be considered pervious.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-32       | p20-32/33 required tree survey definition of "canopy" says aerial. Survey should not be required for an undisturbed area. it's still a forest & it doesn't matter if it's Oaks or poplars   | The tree survey required for tree save or green areas used for credit toward green area requirements only requires a survey of the area of the site, not specific trees.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-33       | p 20-33 section 20.18 A. #3. spacial tree data CLDSM does not detail anything on Spacial Tree Data. Would be better to describe the requirement and provide specific reference then make us go to every page in two different books to find what you are referring to   | This is a practice throughout the UDO to keep the most technical standards outside of the UDO. This standard will be added to the CLDSM before the effective date of the UDO.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Article 20 -Council meeting on 6/27/22 Amending the the Tree Documents/ outside of the UDO is just a way to hide outside the public eye. Transparency is important. The chance of conflict when you have parallel documents is high. Keep all rules in one place. worst case at least specifically say in Article 20 that you buried rules on taxpayers in another document & tell us where to look   | A public hearing will be held on the amendment to the Tree Ordinance to enact heritage tree protection on the same night as the UDO public hearing. Highlights of the amendments to the Tree Ordinance amendment were presented at Virtual Meetings on the UDO. Changes to Chapter 21 of the City Code of Ordinances will also be the subject of community engagement after adoption to ensure residents are aware of the new standards.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 21-1        | p 21-1 last page of all districts says subject to Loading spaces defined page 2-22 Loading Area Space. An unobstructed area, not located within the public right-of-way, maintained for the temporary parking of trucks and other delivery vehicles for the purpose of loading and unloading goods, wares, materials, and merchandise. and last page 4-14 and 5-17, 6-12, 7-17, 8-6, 9-17, 10-16, 11-16, 12-17, 13-18 but the table # 21-1 on page 21-1 doesn't exclude uses, but it doesn't include them. It needs an exception listed added to 21.1 A. "If Use is not listed on Table 21-1 no Off-Street Loading Space is required."  | <p>Loading spaces shall be required for new construction as per the effective date of the ordinance. Any existing buildings without loading spaces or with fewer than the required number of loading spaces at effective date are exempted.</p> <p>Table 21-1 provides guidance, by use, of the number of loading spaces required. If a use is not listed, such as single-family residential, multi-family attached, or the residential component of a mixed-use development, then there is no loading space requirement.</p> | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 21-1        | page 21-2 Section 21-3 Solid Waste typo: 'Chapter 10' twice.<br>" The purpose of the solid waste service area standards is to provide safe and convenient access for users and service providers during the depositing and collection of solid waste and recyclable materials and to encourage waste reduction. Where the standards of this section for required solid waste service areas conflict with Chapter 10 of the City Code shall control."  | This is intentional for clarity.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | <p>15-2: The use matrix for the RC-1 Zoning District was not updated to reflect the intent of the district which is mixed use. The table should include the following for the RC-1 District:</p> <p>Residential Uses allowed by PC: MF Dwelling Attached and Stacked, Dwelling - Quad, Dwelling - Townhouse, Multi-Dwelling Dev,</p> <p>Uses allowed: Amusement Facility Indoor and Outdoor, Art Gallery, Arts and Fitness Studio, Broadcast Facility w/wo antennae, Commercial Kitchen, Hotel/Motel, Industrial Design, Micro production of Alcohol, Financial Institution (no Drive Thru), Medical Office, Office, Personal Service Establishment, R&amp;D, Restaurant/Bar (no drive thru), Community Center, Cultural Facility, Education Facility (Preschool, Primary/Secondary, University or College), Place of Worship, Public Safety Facility, Healthcare, Institution, Office Campus, Public Transit Facility, Community Garden, Childcare (accessory to employment), Helistop, Outdoor Seating/Activity Area</p> <p>Uses allowed by PC: Convention Center, Live Performance Venue, Neighborhood Commercial Establishment, Outdoor Market, Specialty Food Service, Retail Goods Establishment and Showroom, Childcare Center and Childcare Center Large, Educational (Vocational), Edu Campus, Gov Campus, Medical Campus, Research Campus, Craft Industrial, Light Industrial, Movie Studio, Beneficial Fill Site, LCID, Parking Structure, Conservation Area, Farm, Driving Range, Public Park, Utility, Wireless Communications, All Temp Uses, Outdoor Entertainment</p> | Specific uses allowed in the RC-1 district will be clarified in an upcoming draft.  | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.3             | 15.3 PRINCIPAL USES: PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS<br>Single Room Occupancy (SRO): Further clarification is needed to limit the use of what is commonly referred to as "student-housing" where individual rooms are rented to separate tenants within one dwelling unit. It is not clear how this definition and standards would apply to this industry product type. If it does not, then a separate definition and use standards are needed. | The product type described is classified as multi-family, not SRO. The City Attorney's Office has advised that zoning cannot differentiate between housing units that are rented by the unit and those that are rented by the room.<br><br>The definition of an SRO will be updated to better clarify the difference between and SRO and rent-by-the-room multifamily.                    | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.3             | 15.3 PRINCIPAL USES: PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS<br>For all uses noted as PC in the RC-1 district the following note should be added to each PC use designated [Insert Use]in the RC-1 District shall be designed as a component of a larger mixed-use development that includes multiple buildings comprised of multiple uses, exclusive of [insert use] uses.  | Staff believes that free standing buildings with individual uses can be a viable component of an RC-1 campus and does not recommend a change.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.6             | 15.6 USE DEFINITIONS<br>Dormitory. A building intended or used principally for sleeping accommodations. A common kitchen and common gathering rooms for social purposes may also be provided. This definition does not address this product type either  | The product type described is classified as multi-family, not a dormitory. The City Attorney's Office has advised that zoning cannot differentiate between housing units that are rented by the unit and those that are rented by the room.<br><br>The definition of a dormitory will be updated to better clarify the difference between and dormitory and rent-by-the-room multifamily. | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 15.6             | 15.6 USE DEFINITIONS<br>The Single Room Occupancy (SRO) definition does not account for student housing, where rooms are leased for a longer duration. A new definition and development standards are needed for the latter.   | The product type described is classified as multi-family, not SRO. The City Attorney's Office has advised that zoning cannot differentiate between housing units that are rented by the unit and those that are rented by the room.<br><br>The definition of an SRO will be updated to better clarify the difference between and SRO and rent-by-the-room multifamily.                    | Yes                      |
| 6/28/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Article 20 - Cheers to the provisions regarding native & non-invasive species!!! This is FANTASTIC! Perhaps the mix of deciduous & evergreen ratio could be revisited? Yes, evergreens give year round attraction, but we need a mix of both to properly support native bugs & birds. (Part I)   | The requirement for 40% evergreen trees, in addition to evergreen shrubbery, is sufficient to support the purposes of the article.  | No                       |
| 6/28/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Also, this article is hard to read, with so much crossed out info. Is the tree caliper requirement still in there? I think that's important even though it had been reduced (boo). (Part II)   | There is still a minimum caliper requirement for trees planted to meet green area (20.15) frontage tree planting (20.16) and tree planting (20.17) depending on the project and the nature of the standard. The second draft did not reduce any of the caliper requirements for tree planting from what was proposed in the first draft.  | No                       |
| 6/28/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | As well, in reference to pruning/care (per the Arborist) section, why are Duke Power/Asplundh not held to these standards? Can that be added? The butchery they do on trees is a horror show. Half the time it seems that they should have just taken down the entire tree versus the hacked up version they leave behind. (Part III)  | Utilities are permitted to trim city street trees in accordance with agreements between the City and the utility provider. This allowance will be included in the Tree Ordinance outside of the UDO as this pruning activity is not a development activity subject to the UDO.  | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page      | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/28/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-54            | <p>page 15-54. 2nd draft- An ADU located within an accessory structure shall comply with the following additional requirements:</p> <p>a. The ADU shall have a total floor area no greater than 50% of the total floor area of the principal residential use.</p> <p>Comment: There are still homes with less than 1000 square feet of total floor area in Charlotte. Many are between 700-900 sq.ft. Some are still in desirable neighborhoods. Allowing residents whose homes are less than 1000 sq. ft. to build a 500 maximum square feet ADU would allow the ADU to have a bedroom which could increase affordable rental units in Charlotte. This change could help lower income residents build an ADU to bring in rental income. There are many homes who have large garage/mother-in-law suites which go unused/unrented. These are often larger than 1000 square feet.</p> | <p>The approach to ADUs in the draft UDO is different than the regulatory language for ADUs in the current Zoning Ordinance. For example, ADUs will now be allowed on properties with duplex development so long as the dwelling units are not on their own sublots; the square footage allowance has been adjusted; the setback requirements have been relaxed.</p> <p>It is the city's desire that this improves the ability for the construction of ADUs. However, staff will continue to evaluate the effects of these adjustments going forward to determine if they have the desired result or if there are additional opportunities for adjustments to further spur ADU development to help mitigate affordability issues and dwelling unit needs throughout the city.</p> | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 21.2(C)               | <p>if a lot has multiple frontages, the primary designation could be determined by length not which frontage is most applicable for loading from a safety and traffic volume standpoint. There should be flexibility for lots with multiple frontages; and possibly discourage loading on 4+ lane blvd. or arterials but primary is too restrictive in an individual site context without understanding the network around each site.</p>  | <p>Per Article 3.5.C, for lots with multiple frontages, the primary frontage is the longest frontage if none of the frontages are designated as a primary frontage type. The frontage approach was developed with the establishment of the new TOD districts and staff believes that it should be retained.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20 (Also 31?) | <p>Encourage the City to put in tree protections for "paper streets," or unapproved rights-of-way as they do with approved rights-of-way in the UDO. Would like to see the adaption of paper streets as environmentally protected areas which adhere to the heritage tree and Tree Ordinance standards.</p>  | <p>City regulation protecting trees on paper rights-of-way that are not accepted by the City bring numerous legal and resource issues. These legal and resource issues outweigh the minimal amount of land across the City dedicated as paper right-of-way to warrant City acceptance and protection. The City will continue to pursue tree preservation through its programs and policies, including the Tree Canopy Preservation Program (TCPP). Abandoned areas of paper rights-of-way that become private property may become or be used as required green area. The UDO will not require heritage tree protection or allow required green area to be located in paper rights-of-way.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.5                  | <p>Article 19.5 - Missing language to mitigate noise and light pollution of parking structures next to residences. Would like to see the City consider adding in details on how to lessen these effects through specific guidelines for developers.</p>  | <p>Article 16.2 regulates exterior lighting which limits the maximum foot candles at the property line. Article 19.7 also requires all levels of a parking structure be screened by a wall or panel at least 42" in height, which is designed to limit vehicle headlights spilling beyond the structure. Noise pollution is addressed by Section 16.7 or by the City's Noise Ordinance.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14                 | <p>Article 20.14 - NOT in support of heritage tree removal permits that will allow removal in all cases. would like to see the final version of the UDO go back to the original standard outlined in Draft 1: "Preservation of Heritage Tree required unless there is no other reasonable location." There should be no tree removal fee reduction for the planting of new trees. Strong disincentives are necessary to maintain the existing mature tree canopy. Funds from these fees are important to support the Urban Forestry Department.</p>  | <p>Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.</p>   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Article 20 - Missing language for the protection of heritage trees on paper streets. Urging the city to please consider protecting these trees as they do on city property.   | City regulation protecting trees on paper rights-of-way that are not accepted by the City bring numerous legal and resource issues. These legal and resource issues outweigh the minimal amount of land across the City dedicated as paper right-of-way to warrant City acceptance and protection. The City will continue to pursue tree preservation through its programs and policies, including the Tree Canopy Preservation Program (TCPP). Abandoned areas of paper rights-of-way that become private property may become or be used as required green area. The UDO will not require heritage tree protection or allow required green area to be located in paper rights-of-way. | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.2             | Article 19.2 - Support parking reductions for significant trees.  | Thank you for your comment.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.18.D          | Article 20.18.D - Fully support the Tree Conservation Fund, the Street Tree Planting Fund, and the Canopy Care Fund   | Staff has noted and recorded your comment.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-41       | Page 15-41, item 6 states unilaterally that Off Street Parking shall be retained for commercial properties. In order to meet the 2040 SMP, parking spaces need to be removed to encourage other forms of transit.   | Neighborhood Commercial Establishments are located in lower-density Neighborhood 1 place types. Many individuals require vehicles for mobility, even within their own neighborhoods, because of permanent or temporary disability or other reasons. If existing parking spaces are removed, vehicles would need to try to find nearby on-street parking or elect not to patronize the business. The first scenario would use on-street parking that neighborhood residents need and rely on, and the second would diminish the economic viability of the Neighborhood Commercial Establishment.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | Article 20.14 - No tree removal fee reductions for planting of new trees - strong disincentives needed to keep our canopy!  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4             | Article 16.4 - Not in favor of allowing of heritage trees for affordable housing development allowances. Protecting our tree canopy provides a better environment for all residents, including the residents of affordable housing. City should work with developers to incorporate the existing tree canopy of heritage trees instead of allowing them to be taken down. | Section 16.4 does not provide allowances to remove heritage trees that are not already allowed in Article 20. Section 16.4 provides more flexibility for replanting.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.12.B.2.a.i.A  | 20.12.B.2.a.i.A Just a thank you for adding the verbiage on below-grade waste containers. Well done. :)   | Thank you for your comment.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.1 & 19.3      | Article 19.1 and Article 19.3 - Fully support enhanced measures to increase biking and electric vehicle infrastructure and required parking for EV charging.  | Thank you for your comment.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4             | Article 16.4 - Fully support the incorporation of park and recreational elements in hopes of seeing more public green spaces in the city.   | Thank you for your comment.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4             | <p>16.4 Affordable Housing Development Allowances Section 3: "A new street, in whole or in part, shall not be required, per Section 32.5, if that street or a portion of such street does not provide access to the affordable housing development, as determined by the SSI Administrator, and that street does not connect to an existing street on abutting property. In lieu of construction of the street or portion of such street, the right-of-way shall be dedicated for future construction of the street or portion of such street."</p> <p>Comment: Wording that covers bike/pedestrian and greenway connections would be helpful if they exist or are planned. Right-of-way dedication would also work.</p>   | The referenced section includes right-of-way dedication which would allow construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities if they are a priority.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.5             | <p>16.5 Affordable Housing Development Allowances. A.6 of the new draft the city staff added: "Where mitigation is required for removal of heritage trees, planting of twice the number of required mitigation trees shall be allowed in lieu of the mitigation fee per Article 20. The mitigation trees may also be counted towards perimeter tree plantings per Section 20.17.C when they meet all perimeter tree planting requirements".</p> <p>Comment: We think it would be important to specify that the tree replanting should take place in the same areas where the trees are removed so that the local community will experience the direct benefits of the replaced trees (ie, shade, mitigation of urban heat island effect).</p>  | Mitigation tree planting is required to be on the property from which a heritage tree is removed.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1       | <p>Part 8. General Development Zoning Standards - Art. 19. Off-Street Vehicle &amp; Bicycle Parking - Table 19-1: Vehicle Parking Requirements. "Minimum Applies only when within 200' 400' of a Neighborhood 1 Place Type"</p> <p>Comment: In Tier 3, where uses within 200' feet from the N1 types of neighborhoods required minimum parking, that distance has been increased to 400'. This increase from 200' to 400' near our transit stations has severe consequences and impedes building an environment inclusive for non-motorists. We request that this not apply within a ¼ mile of a rapid transit station, especially with restaurants/bar uses.</p>  | In many locations, Neighborhood 1 Place Types are within 1/4 mile of a rapid transit station. Staff believes that the identified uses should provide a limited amount of parking when close to the N1 Place Type and does not recommend a change.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1       | <p>Table 19-1: Vehicle Parking Requirements - Uses Dwelling – Multi-Family Also applies to the residential component of mixed-use development:</p> <p>Comment: Again, in the neighborhoods that fall under Tier 3 parking requirements, the developer would have to provide at least one parking spot per dwelling unit. We think one parking spot per dwelling unit close to the TOD is excessive. We request that this rule doesn't apply to any land uses located within ¼ of a mile from the light rail stations.</p>  | The second draft UDO has been amended to allow development, regardless of its zoning, that occurs within 1/2 mile of an existing rapid transit station to use the Tier 3 parking requirements (typically no minimums) unless the development is in a Neighborhood 1 place type. (Reference Article 19.2.H) Staff believes this approach is appropriate at this time. Parking standards will be reevaluated over time as the community evolves. | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1       | <p>Table 19-1: Vehicle Parking Requirements - Waste Management Facility + Recycling Collection Center-</p> <p>Comment: In Tier 3 increase the Maximum to 1/500 sqft from 1/250 sqft for both.</p>  | Staff does not recommend this change because the proposed standard would decrease the maximum parking allowed (from 4 spaces per 1000 sq ft to 2 spaces per 1000 sq ft) and is not consistent with other similar uses.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | <p>20.14 Heritage Trees - Part 2 B 2b. "Heritage trees that are sufficiently diseased, injured, dead, or are in danger of falling shall not be required to obtain a City-issued tree work permit or mitigate the tree loss prior to removal. Trees removed without a permit due to health or hazard shall be either certified by an ISA-certified arborist or adequately documented through picture, video or other documentation prior to removal.</p> <p>Comment: Trees removed without a permit due to health or hazard shall be either certified by an ISA-certified arborist "or" adequately documented through picture, video or other documentation prior to removal. The "or" in the preceding statement is concerning (bolded with quotations). Our concern is that without a permit or a way of tracking dying, diseased trees, it could be exploited as a loophole to take down trees that are not in such conditions. No one will take a tree down alone, so an arborist or tree service would be involved. We propose filing a post-permit with appropriate proof in these cases. This would allow for fast action and not endanger property or persons but would provide accountability.</p> | The intent of this provision is to allow homeowners to act with expedience in the instance of a tree being diseased or hazardous. The City must allow dangerous trees to be removed without a permit. If this provision is ultimately used to work around the heritage tree standard, staff will revise this language accordingly.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 16       | <p>Allowing front-loaded garages is a blatant surrender to REBIC and their car-focused, low-cost demands. Please do better than this.</p>  | State law does not allow limitations on front-loaded garages.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1       | I have made numerous comments on the parking minimums remaining for select uses "within 400' of Neighborhood 1 place type." This is just bad policy, and anyone engaged in urban planning should know this. Charlotte was built for cars, but we know this is not the best way to build our urban centers. When I asked about this, the official response I received was that they "don't want parking spilling out into the neighborhoods." That cannot be policy. That is taking the complaints of people who choose to live close to walkable areas, and requiring that those areas become less walkable. Yes, even requiring just a few spaces will make these places less walkable and waste land. Our neighborhood streets are loaded with free parking spaces that belong to the public, not to the adjacent homes. (Part I)   | Many older established neighborhoods near centers or transit stations were developed without off-street parking and have no options other than on-street parking spaces. Requiring a minimal amount of parking for certain uses in close proximity to these neighborhoods will help preserve on-street parking for neighborhood residents. The feedback staff has received from residents in these neighborhoods does not suggest that "neighborhood streets are loaded with free parking spaces" but quite the opposite.                   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Table 19-1       | The second issue with this policy is the fact that it is targeted to specific uses that, aside from residential, serve alcohol. This is a public safety concern. Policy that enables impaired driving is bad for our collective health. Why not encourage ride-share somehow instead? The reason this doesn't make sense is that it was written for people who don't want other people parking in the asphalt in front of their homes. That is it. Making this policy is wrong. We should be better than this. (Part II)  | This comment suggests that no one should drive to a restaurant that serves alcohol, and by extension no parking should be required for these uses. This would logically apply to all restaurants City-wide, even in areas not adequately served by transit. Staff is of the opinion that most people who drive to restaurants where alcoholic beverages are available do not become impaired nor do they create a public safety concern.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Charlotte needs to Do a better job at protecting our most important resource our trees. Developers are exploiting Charlotte's weak tree regulations. They continue to cut all the trees down and plant a few non native tree species back. Completely ruining the local ecosystems and destroying life. Ruining our stream health and marking the area boring and ugly. Developers are making ridiculous amounts of money by disrespecting our forests and ecosystems. Even if trees are "dying" or "sick" there should still be a fee that is required to be paid to cut them down. These trees benefit our ecosystems. Make developers pay their fair share. Incorporating our existing trees should be a priority as well, in development. Why let developers take the easy way and clear cut everything. It's really shameful. We also need to focus on planting native tree species. These native trees are best acclimated to our climate. They also provide for "wildlife" and our "ecosystems".<br><br>Non native trees including Chinese elm, and crape myrtle are way over planted. They are also taking away our from the charm of our area. Native trees provide a sense of community and pride in our area. These non native Trees continue to make the area generic. Where these trees are planted the city can be mistaken for any other city in the south east. Before we loose our greatest asset (our forests). Let's make developers pay their fare share. And protect our trees/ecosystems from complete destruction. | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft is an important step toward balancing the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. For instance, the proposed approach to heritage tree protection will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will continue to study and improve this article in the future once staff determines whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | I wholeheartedly support the focus on the protection, maintenance, and increase planting of trees in our city. And am glad this is reflected in Article 20. I encourage this team to increase all protections to ensure our green crown, a hallmark of our city for decades, is restored. Please do all we can to ensure that developers are prevented from clearing all trees from proposed work sites.  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Staff have noted and recorded your comment.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | <p>I oppose the effective nullification of protection for 'Heritage Trees,' by insertion of the clause, "Removal allowed where there is a demonstrated conflict,' rather than the prior, 'there is no other reasonable location.' This exception is equal to the totality of the rule. The ordinance (or laws of any sort, on any topic) only becomes relevant in situations where there is a 'conflict' between the preferred actions of the individual (in this case, the developer) and the public interest and wishes. The UDO appears to validate a developer's personal wishes by stating, 'A documented and confirmed conflict may include but not be limited to the location of structures,' which of course is what developers do. To assert that 'Heritage Trees' need not be preserved where they conflict with a developer's wishes, is equal to asserting that the ordinance does not exist, and is only a polite suggestion to developers. There is no reason to believe that such a vacated ordinance will effect any reduction in the terrifying loss of large trees or tree cover generally in Charlotte.</p> <p>The conspicuous phrase change at the beginning of the tree preservation section, 'Heritage trees shall be protected to the greatest extent possible,' deleting the previous 'at all times, subject to the requirements of this Article,' appears to signal a surrender by the City and acceptance of tree loss. The following, 'Heritage trees shall may be removed when a City-issued tree work permit is requested and approved,' replacing the previous negative formulation '...shall not be removed unless...' also appears to forfeit the city's agency and interest in protecting trees. The UDO summary also shockingly states, 'When homeowners are making decisions to remove trees outside of the development process, the second draft continues to require a permit for heritage tree removal. However, permits will allow removal in all cases.' In lieu of the global biological meltdown and rapid climate overheating now underway, and accordingly high value of our remaining trees, I urge reversion to the prior statement. The city has a fundamental right and interest in compelling landowners not to destroy large trees on existing home lots, and the change to the UDO second draft is wrong.</p> | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.15            | I oppose the greater allowance for developers to simply donate money to the Parks & Recreation Department in lieu of actually meeting on-site open space requirements. There is no means of assuring that the money will tangibly mitigate or 'offset' the destruction of green areas by the developer. More perniciously, there will exist a long-term political tendency for these fees to substitute for, rather than augment, the Department budget, leading to a regression to the familiar pattern of token preservation amid a sprawling carpet of destruction, rather than any substantive, meaningful preservation of Charlotte as an ecological whole. More broadly, the notion of 'offsets' falsely implies that the purpose of the UDO is to maintain some sort of net-zero-impact paper accounting within the area under Charlotte's jurisdiction, rather than protecting the integrity of neighborhoods, watersheds, and the aesthetic circumference for people and wildlife alike.  | Staff will continue to work with Mecklenburg County staff to ensure that any fees collected will be used to expand the park system which is the intent of this option.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.2             | I am glad there is a provision in there for increased species diversity! I think there should also be mitigation requirements for dead, diseased, and hazardous trees under the Land Development Heritage Tree Protection section.   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14.B          | 20.14.B – Please save our heritage trees. Do not allow specimen trees to be saved in-lieu of mitigation payment. Mandate that all specimen trees have to be saved unless there is no alternative. Then assign a cost based on the realistic replacement of a tree of the same age and size as the one being removed.   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Regarding article 20, I am strongly opposed to allowing the removal of "champion trees". This will destroy neighborhoods.  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | I would like there to be a rule that one cannot clear cut every tree from lot line to lot line. Trees within 10 ft of line should be left.   | Staff interprets these standards as sufficient to meet the purpose and intent of the tree protection sections of the UDO. Preservation of existing trees is required in many instances through green area requirements in Section 20.15. In addition, the new heritage tree preservation standard provides additional protection for large mature trees located outside of the proposed development area of a site.                | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 16-7        | page 16-7. there is no Affordable Housing Fee Schedule except in a powerpoint not available to the public- either insert the concept or provide the Schedule in supporting documents   | The affordable housing fee schedule will be included in the next draft.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | page 20-18, 20-19, 20-24 the following are in the UDO as requirements but do not exist, and are not in the Supporting Documents. The information necessary to review the UDO is not available. Charlotte Tree Manual Penalties (page 20-18), impacts allowed to CRZ (#4 top of page 20-19), Mitigation standards & fee schedule (20-18) Conditions of the Special Agreement between City & Park in Rec (page20-24)   | Staff is in the process of developing this guidance and will continue to share all available supporting documents once available.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 20-36       | page 20-36 appeals reference #E2 to Article 38 but reference is wrong. Article 37 is correct   | This change will be made in the next draft.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Article 20- I believe that builders are removing heritage trees and willing to pay the fines, as the fines are too low. If a builder wishes to clear cut all, or a portion of vacant land, the fine needs to be at least \$2500 per tree, with an escalation of the fine based on the trunk circumference. Paying a \$1500 fine per tree, and then planting a 4' sapling (to replace a healthy 80 year old white oak, ginkgo or magnolia) is an inexpensive decision for builders.<br><br>We are permitting the needless destruction of the tree canopy and adding to environmental issues by permitting the destruction of heritage trees, particularly when in-fill construction occurs. | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Article 20 tree canopy should be enforced and widen to require more trees in the city please. Trees are needed to fight climate change   | The UDO proposes additional tree planting and preservation requirements that exceed the required tree planting under the current Tree Ordinance. Staff does not recommend increasing these requirements.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Please require more trees planted in city to fight climate change.   | The UDO proposes additional tree planting and/or preservation requirements that exceed the required tree planting under the current Tree Ordinance. Staff does not recommend increasing these requirements.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | My comment is specifically regarding Article 20 Section 14; the update to Heritage trees.Regarding this update: based on factually based independent research, Charlotte is already losing it's tree canopy at alarming rates.The proposed revision will only accelerate the issue to the detriment of our community.We as a community should be putting more safeguards in place for one of our most valuable resource not less.I am extremely concerned and disappointed by the proposed revision. Please reconsider.  | The heritage tree standard is a new requirement that is not in the current tree ordinance. Staff believes that, as proposed, this additional requirement will help preserve tree canopy and ensure that tree canopy lost will be replanted to ensure greater tree canopy in the future.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Tree Save<br>I think this area needs to be made tighter, not allow for clear cutting. One of the issues many residents have is when green space is limited between developments because builders are both claiming the same tree save area but it's actually part of someone's property lines or just outside within 10 feet. We do need to leave room for canopy growth and are not getting close to it in new neighborhoods when clear cutting is part of the building process. Why are inspectors not on site prior to clear cutting? This might encourage more heritage tree save.   | Urban Forestry staff review and conduct site visits to ensure proper tree protection is in place prior to tree removal in development. Staff believes the second draft UDO proposes several improvements that will increase the amount of tree preservation while also balancing the need for flexibility in some development scenarios.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-34       | <p>Page 15-34: Prescribed Conditions for Townhome.<br/>150' max for Townhomes in violation of NC GS 160D-702.<br/>"Bulk" can be regulated in 160D-702. Websters dictionary says Bulk is: "not divided into parts or packaged in separate units", but there is no authority for municipalities to regulate the size of a single-family dwellings even with the reference to "bulk." City cannot dictate the maximum length of a building if the lot size (setbacks, buffers, and such) is large enough.<br/>Same aesthetic articulation standards on chart page 5-6 (line B) and page 4-6 chart under E contains Articulation requirement with maximum length</p> <p>In most instances, a triplex is a 3-unit townhome and a quad is a 4-unit townhome so imposing a length requirement on a 'Townhome' does not make sense.</p>  | Per 160D-702(a), zoning regulations "...may regulate and restrict the height, number of stories, and size of buildings and other structures..." There are exceptions in subsections (b) and (c) but none apply to townhouses. Staff believes 160D does not preclude the regulation of the length of a townhome building, as it would fall into the category of "size".   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Our community is outraged, extremely disappointed and feels completely unrepresented by the gross act of removing the Short Term Rental Article from the UDO. We will understand which parties are responsible for the removal of the Article and inaction and vote accordingly during the next election cycle. Please consider making the Short Term Rental problem a priority to address and stop caving in to the LOUD minority, their lawyers and lobbyists.   | At this time the City Attorney's Office has advised staff to remove language regulating short-term rentals from the draft UDO due to legal uncertainties. If/when the legal and legislative uncertainties surrounding this type of use becomes more clear, the City Attorney's Office will work with staff to develop appropriate standards.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Page 15-34       | <p>page 15-34 Prescribed conditions on a Dwelling - Quadraplex<br/>A quadraplex is a "townhome with 4 units" (not 5) so why the restriction that it must be on an Arterial in N1? what purpose is furthered by allowing triplex but not quad's if the lot width allows?</p>  | This standard for a quadraplex is based on Policy 2.1 of the Comprehensive Plan.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | <p>I fear that the Charlotte UDO should include additional restrictions on restaurant / bar use adjacent to Neighborhood 1 (residential) zoning district. These requirements would be located in Article 15.4.XXX.</p> <p>First, there is no difference between a restaurant where food is primarily served and bar/tavern where drinks/alcohol is primarily served. This designation is important when considering the use and separation requirements for different zoning districts.<br/>Second, there are no separation requirements between restaurants and bar/taverns and neighborhood (residential) zoning districts.<br/>Charlotte adopted a text amendment 2013-090 in July 2014 to define eating, drinking and entertainment establishments. (EDEE) Two types were defined, Type I were establishments that did not sell alcohol and Type II, establishments where they did not sell alcohol. It created separation requirements based on hours of operation and the presence of outdoor entertainment.</p> <p>The process included a significant amount of work by the planning staff with extensive research on the subject and a lot of community input with over 10 meetings with the public over the period of three years. A survey was done of 20+ metropolitan areas from Atlanta to Washington, DC and a majority had separation requirements from residential districts for restaurants and 75% had separation requirements from bars to residential districts. Even recently developed UDOs are making the differentiation between bars and restaurants and have separation requirements such as Raleigh's UDO.</p> <p>The process resulted in a 36-page text amendment to the zoning code that includes requirements for separation distances, outdoor dining, and hours of operation to minimize conflict between EDEEs and their surrounding properties.</p> <p>My recommendation is that Charlotte planning department do a similar survey of the how other cities regulate restaurants and bars adjacent to residential properties and present this information to the public so that we can see how the new Charlotte UDO will compare on this issue.</p> <p>In addition, I recommend that the Charlotte UDO include separate definitions between bar/tavern and</p> | The UDO eliminates the differentiation between the various types of EDEEs to simplify and modernize the ordinance. The impact of such uses on nearby neighborhoods is primarily related to noise. The UDO restricts the hours where restaurants and bars may have open windows or serve outdoors when within 100 feet of a Neighborhood 1 lot line.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Charlotte heritage trees should be preserved at all costs. It is not enough for the developers to simply pay a small fine for the removal of a mature tree and plant a small tree somewhere as compensation. Charlotte is known for it's tree canopy. With the immense growth Charlotte has it is essential for our trees to remain to combat all the cars and carbon monoxide that come with growth. It should be very very hard for anyone to cut down a mature tree in Charlotte. The developers can start by putting a reasonably sized structure instead of the development that is allowed now in Charlotte, when they tear down a smaller house, then they won't need to cut any trees. Please vote to save our trees and Charlotte   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased. | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Suburban projects (multi-family N2 and single family N1) essentially have to provide on-site tree save, with limited open space overlap, and no guarantee you can remove trees and 're-plant'. So, if the trees are located in the middle of the parcel, it is a staff call whether you can remove those and replant along the edges.   | The current tree ordinance does not allow residential subdivision sites to remove trees and replant them as a standard option. Providing this staff review and approval is an additional measure of flexibility for instances where the location of trees create undue challenges. In addition, the majority of Charlotte's tree canopy loss occurs on these types of sites. Staff would not support revising this standard further than what is proposed in the second draft.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Remove Footnote #1 in Table 20-5 to allow any project to replant tree save at 150% the required area. We do not want to have the Chief Urban Forester make individual project determinations for every situation. Current ordinance allows for this provision.  | Footnote 1 will not be revised in the next draft as this requirement largely mirrors the current standard. The current ordinance allows trees to be planted for mitigation "where the existing tree canopy must be removed due to conflicting design criteria or hardship approved by the city" at 150% for single family subdivision sites and all sites located within a "wedge". The UDO uses different language but maintains that approval from the city must be granted before trees are removed.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | Tier 3 & 4 are essentially the exact same, recommend combining and ONLY including N1, Parks & Preserve, N2-A, CG, CR. Allow for land dedication, amenitized tree areas (ratio 0.5)  | The majority of Charlotte's tree canopy loss is occurring on these Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites and staff does not support adding additional flexibility for these sites. In addition, the differentiation of Tier 3 and Tier 4 is important to maintain due to unique requirements for tree planting in Section 20.17 in addition to the park land dedication option established in the green area credits table in 20.15.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | In section 20.14, I believe the language should revert back to draft one in order to provide more protection to heritage trees. All over the city I've seen beautiful, old trees cut down to make way for an empty back yard or apartment complex. The city needs to stand up for what makes it special - a tree canopy that attracts wildlife, cools temperatures in the summer, and provides color and life for our neighborhoods. Giving developers an option to cut down these trees so they can increase their profits is leading to a sad future for our city. (Part I)   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | I also believe the tree removal fee should not have a reduction option. Planting a new tree is very different than preserving a tree that needed decades to grow to its current size. I am actually in favor of a significant fee increase (\$5,000 - \$10,000 feels appropriate) in order to convince developers with the only thing that's important to them - the impact to their bottom line. We will never stop losing heritage trees until it is no longer financially beneficial for a developer to cut them down. I do agree with the exception for dead or diseased trees. We need to focus our efforts on the trees with the best potential for long term value to the city. (Part II)  | The fees for heritage tree removal were increased for land development scenarios in the second draft. Staff believes this approach is a good first step and we will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.18            | Finally, I do support the tree preservation funding outlined in section 20.18. Anything we can do to help recover from the tree loss of the past few years will only serve to benefit Charlotte in the future. (Part III)   | Staff has received and noted your comment of support.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | 20.14 - I have been a volunteer now for about three years on the Treasure Tree Committee, reviving the Treasure Tree Program here in Mecklenburg County. I've read through all of the dramatic changes in this section related to Heritage Trees, and the lack of oversight here in the new draft is extremely concerning. I've seen what lack of oversight results in with Heritage Trees on private property. Just this year, a Willow Oak with circumference of more than 20 feet was simply removed after the sale of the home. Not for expanding the home or building any new structure, either. After removal, it was very clear the tree was healthy with no central trunk rot or decay. The crown spread was nearly 120 feet as well, so every bit of that canopy shade was lost. Every bit of the benefit to birds and small mammals was lost. All of the connected mycorrhizal fungi was just ripped away with the root ball after it was ground to a pulp. When you use a term to protect these trees "to the greatest extent possible," that means absolutely nothing to a property developer or a homeowner. All they need to say is, "we tried." I only ask that you strengthen the wording in this portion of the UDO to remove loopholes. If you use vague wording, any lawyer can find a way to get a homeowner or developer out of any fines or remediation as a result of just cutting down a Heritage Tree. | A major component of this approach is to increase funding and staffing for the enforcement of these provisions. The new requirement to apply for a permit to remove heritage trees (whether land is being developed or not) will result in increased funding, staffing and greater enforcement to ensure these heritage trees will be better protected. Staff has analyzed the economic impact of the first draft proposal and heard comments on both sides of this issue during the first draft engagement phase. Staff believes that the second draft standard balances flexibility and the community desires to preserve trees. | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | The UDO should allow for the zone between building and back of sidewalk to count as open space if designed to meet the open space requirements and amenitized. The draft ordinance pushes for buildings close to the street in a build to zone, but then in some districts requires large setbacks which create a dead zone between sidewalk and building that is unusable for building, parking, open space, etc. Staff has confirmed this can be used for open space; but we still need to clean up the language that requires open space to be 'bounded' by a building in the definitions to count this zone as open space. | The area between a building and back of sidewalk will be able to be counted as open space as long as it meets the open space requirements. Open space does not have to be bounded by a building unless it is being counted toward a build-to zone.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Permit Healthcare Institutions up to 50,000 sq feet inclusive of overnight stays in the OFC district.  | The ordinance will be changed to allow healthcare institutions up to 25,000 sq ft in the OFC district.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Permit medical, dental and individual office buildings (not limited to "office campus") in the OFC district.   | The office campus definition will be updated to clarify that medical and dental offices are allowed. The definition, as currently written, does not preclude individual office buildings.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Permit the use of additional commercial & institutional uses in the OFC district (fitness, financial institutions, R&D, childcare, educational).   | Based on current definition, these uses will be allowed if they are supportive of the campus intent.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Clarify that residential uses are permitted within campus districts as stand alone/individual developments through more clear definitions.   | Residential uses are allowed in the Campus districts according to the campus uses allowed in each district. They are intended to be a component of a primary campus use such as an education facility with dormitories.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Simplify the definitions for Townhome / Multi-Family Attached. Both appear to reference 5 or more attached units.  | Townhouses (on sublots) and multi-family attached (on a single property) are treated differently by Building Code and State Statutes and therefore are defined differently in the UDO.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Permit additional commercial uses in ML-1(art galleries, car washes, animal care, etc)   | Staff does not believe the listed uses are consistent with the ML-1 district intent and ML Place Type, and does not recommend changes.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 15       | Permit hospitals in additional districts.  | Staff believes that hospitals are allowed in the appropriate districts, consistent with the Place Types which are the basis for the UDO zoning districts.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.3             | While different from the previous draft, the electric vehicle parking requirement is still incompatible with the market. I would recommend an initial threshold of 10% for a period of five years with a commitment to revisit and increase that threshold based on changing market conditions. Currently, well less than 1% of vehicles registered in North Carolina are electric cars. It is not likely this figure will jump to 20% of all vehicles on the road overnight, especially considering the average base model is now priced in excess of \$50,000.   | Current estimates are that 3% of multi-family residents need charging facilities for electric vehicles. The draft UDO requires actual installed EV charging stations in multi-family development for 2% of the provided spaces. The 20% EV-Capable requirement is simply to reserve space in the electrical room for future EV charging and a raceway to future EV parking when demand increases. | No                       |
| 6/20/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14.B.5        | 20.14.B.5. This language implies that private homeowners may be subject to penalties for pruning Heritage Trees on their property without a permit from the City. This section needs to be clarified, as it potentially represents a potential violation of private property rights.   | This standard would require homeowners to apply for a permit for pruning of heritage trees to ensure pruning is conducted according to industry standards and to protect the health of the tree.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 19       | We are in support of the enhanced measures to increase biking and electric vehicle infrastructure (Article 19.1) and required parking for EV charging (Article 19.3)   | Thank you for your comments.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.3             | We support the New Bonus Menu options including affordable housing at 60% of area median income (AMI), inclusion of EV charging stations above the number required, and bonus points for LEED standards. (Article 16.3). We would encourage the City to require more development to build sustainably and to continue to focus on expanding affordable housing.  | Staff will monitor the success of these incentive programs and consider ways to enhance them in the future.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4             | With the greater incorporation of park and recreational elements (Article 16.4), we hope to see more public green spaces within Charlotte and our NoDa neighborhood. We believe that allowing the donation of this land to the City allows development flexibility while also providing a great benefit to the neighborhood.   | Thank you for your comment.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.18.D          | We are in support of the Tree Conservation Fund, the Street Tree Planting Fund, and the Canopy Care Fund. (Article 20.18.D) We believe in protecting our tree canopy and allowing for these areas of funding will be a great asset to that cause.   | Staff has received and noted your comment.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 19.5             | We are concerned over the missing language to mitigate noise and light pollution of parking structures next to residences (Article 19.5). We would urge the City to consider adding in details on how to lessen these effects through specific guidelines for developers.   | Article 16.2 regulates exterior lighting which limits the maximum foot candles at the property line. Article 19.7 also requires all levels of a parking structure be screened by a wall or panel at least 42" in height, which is designed to limit vehicle headlights spilling beyond the structure. Noise pollution is addressed by Section 16.7 or by the City's Noise Ordinance.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.4             | Removal of heritage trees for Affordable Housing Development Allowances (Article 16.4) should not be allowed. We believe in protecting our tree canopy and our heritage trees and therefore cannot support allowances to remove these trees. We encourage the City to work with developers to incorporate our heritage tree canopy into their designs instead of removal.   | Section 16.4 does not provide allowances to remove heritage trees that are not already allowed in Article 20. Section 16.4 provides more flexibility for replanting.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | We are not in support of heritage tree removal permits that will allow removal in all cases. We would like to see the final version of the UDO go back to the original standard outlined in Draft 1: "Preservation of Heritage Tree required unless there is no other reasonable location." (Article 20.14) We also believe that there should be no tree removal fee reduction for the planting of new trees. Strong disincentives are necessary to maintain the existing mature tree canopy. Funds from these fees are important to support the Urban Forestry Department.   | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 21/31    | We would also encourage the City to put in tree protections for "paper streets," or unapproved rights-of-way as they do with approved rights-of-way in the UDO. We would like to see the adaption of paper streets as environmentally protected areas which adhere to the heritage tree and Tree Ordinance standards, as they play an important role in our tree canopy in NoDa.  | City regulation protecting trees on paper rights-of-way that are not accepted by the City bring numerous legal and resource issues. These legal and resource issues outweigh the minimal amount of land across the City dedicated as paper right-of-way to warrant City acceptance and protection. The City will continue to pursue tree preservation through its programs and policies, including the Tree Canopy Preservation Program (TCPP). Abandoned areas of paper rights-of-way that become private property may become or be used as required green area. The UDO will not require heritage tree protection or allow required green area to be located in paper rights-of-way. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | 20.15 gives me hope that the City means business in setting out regulations to reverse the rapid destruction of our tree canopy. Then I read further and see the alterations in language beginning on 20.18 and feel discouraged that this initiative is being controlled by developers with an interest in making building as simple as possible. Please review your wording and make the regulations more consistent with what you profess to have as your core intent for actually protecting trees. Why has Draft 2 removed so many good elements of tree protection policy? These policies should serve as a deterrent for developers who think completely razing a plot of land is the only way to approach a building project. I find this disgusting and lazy... and it is not enough to mitigate tree destruction by planting a baby tree that may be poor quality or poorly planted and thus will die quickly (but too late for it to be of any consequence to the developer). This seems an insufficient response, and penalties should be ramped back up to let developers know that this is serious and that Charlotteans want our shade trees to remain. Summers are getting unbearably hot, and these trees provide important services to us and our property, but sadly too few people understand this. | Staff is unclear what specific change is being recommended by this comment. Staff has tried to strike a balance between the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | The 2nd draft only makes it easier for developers to get rid of Heritage trees. I disagree with this and believe that we need to do everything we can to preserve our canopy! Strongly disagree with proposed draft!  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.13 and 20.14  | <p>Concerning Article 20.13 and 20.14</p> <p>In the grand scheme of things, I question if the fines proposed for developers removing trees will be much of a deterrent. As it is cheaper and easier to clear cut a lot, than build around existing trees, that savings would negate much of the penalties proposed. Builders can absorb the cost of fines in projects and probably write them off as expenses.</p> <p>Developers who have completely cleared lots and defaced neighborhoods are not homeowners – they are not residents. They are builders, building to make money. That’s great – make it, but not at the expense of the environmental health of the city. This is disruptive to air and water quality, temperature control – everything pointed out in 20.13B that “tree protection standards” are set to promote.</p> <p>It might be of benefit to give builders who recognize these concerns big incentives to leave natural areas; (e.g., tax breaks). Preserving areas means money they are not making, but to continue to allow destruction of so much is at the community’s expense. In my area, there have been acres of woods completely wiped out to cram as many houses in as possible. The developer certainly made out well. The neighborhood, not so much.</p> <p>It seems the City’s gain in the proposal is to pad a tree fund for planting and to keep count of the dwindling tree population. That doesn’t protect trees. Even the “replacement” tree proposal is slight. “\$1500/tree removed + 1 tree planted. Each additional tree planted reduces fee by \$250.” Seriously? Huge trees replaced by small is not in balance.</p> <p>I hope I’m very wrong, but I don’t feel the proposed measures will be enough to preserve much of our tree canopy.</p> | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte’s tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 16.5             | open spaces are no longer open spaces....natural area are continually getting compromised to give flexibility to developers. Open space requirements and tree save should be separate and not count towards one another. If there is a separate requirement for open space and a separate requirement for those listed in 16.5.a.3 then they should both be required separately (and not count towards each others requirements.)   | The UDO open space standards are typically greater than those in the current ordinance, especially for usable open space. Staff believes it is reasonable to allow open space and tree save to overlap if the objectives and standards of both can be met.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.15 C and D    | 20.15 C and D. I am not sure why redevelopment is removed. I hope redevelopments will have requirements for green space and trees!  | The use of the term "redevelopment" was removed from this section because the definition of the term "development" includes redevelopment. Staff are not reducing any standards in this change, only removing a redundancy.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | 20.14 Although most Charlotteans would agree that protecting our city’s tree canopy is a worthy endeavor, the proposed regulations in the UDO 2nd draft regarding Heritage trees is misguided and will hurt the “heritage citizens” of Charlotte. The proposed permitting fees and mitigation requirements will disproportionately affect Charlotte legacy parcels, and therefore disproportionately affect the seniors that own and live on them. The burden will not be borne by those that live in the many post-2000 era subdivisions/developments in our city. For illustrative purposes, Charlotte’s Double Oaks neighborhood comes to mind: a historic tree-lined neighborhood of small older homes (many of which are occupied by life-long senior residents of Charlotte). I picture small house after small house with that one massive oak tree in the front of the house. Are we really going to ask these residents to carry the burden of protecting our canopy? The proposed regulations would surely send any would-be home buyer packing and hurt the home values of those least able to absorb it. Let’s concentrate on having deep-pocketed developers lead this charge by expanding planting and green space requirements for new developments. Trees of over 30in in diameter are often over 60 years old. This is nearing the end of the expected life of many species of native trees. The currently proposed plan is short-sighted in that respect. Let’s require developers to invest in the future of Charlotte’s tree canopy.  | Staff has proposed a two-tiered fee structure for heritage tree removal that would reduce the financial burden on homeowners removing a heritage tree without also developing land. Homeowners would be required to pay a \$500 fine and plant one tree to remove a heritage tree. This fee can be reduced to \$0 if two additional trees are replanted. Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | 20.14            | It is very obvious that any teeth with Charlotte maintaining the heritage trees was lost with this revision. Charlotte continues to give developers leeway and "flexibility" in the name of "process". We are losing our trees at an alarming rate especially our heritage trees. Please put the that trees of a certain caliper cannot be removed as was listed in 2.23  | Staff believes that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow staff to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte’s tree canopy. Staff will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | The Tree Save area shouldn't be compromised by allowing other things to count toward tree save. Developers are continually getting breaks on their requirements instead of the city holding them accountable and making them stick to the requirements. This city council has continually weakened the tree save area, please restore it.  | Staff believes all the green area credit options will help to achieve the purposes and intent of the article. In addition, the UDO increases green area requirements for all sites. Currently, only 10% tree save is required for single family subdivision sites which would be increased to 15% green area in the UDO (which can be achieved by traditional tree save as an option). The payment-in-lieu value has also been increased in the UDO to require higher fees for developments using this option. In addition staff has introduced a multiplier to many of these additional options that requires developments to provide more area when using one of these green area credit options instead of traditional tree save. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part VII. Uses and Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards | Article 20       | amenitized tree area - I would like to see the impervious area be at less than 10%. Impervious areas shouldn't be allowed in tree save areas.  | In general, impervious area will not be allowed widely within tree save areas. Only sites with the option in Table 20 to use amenitized tree area may use this option to meet the green area requirement. Staff believes this option is important to ensure a balance between flexibility and the community desire to enhance and sustain our tree canopy.   | No                       |
| 6/7/2022  | Part IX. Stormwater  | 24.2             | Section 24.2 - 24.2 Institutes a "Storm drainage plan and permit" process prior to any landscape grading that will affect surface drainage on a lot (section D), or any construction on a SF lot (section A), including driveways, parking or any structures. There are no specific requirements and the Storm Water Administrator has complete authority to stipulate whatever he/she thinks appropriate. This is a huge change and will require another permitting step (and fees) for every small project in town, as well as numerous small projects that currently require no permitting.<br>Suggestion: Specific stipulations that specify that permits are only required where proposed changes will increase the current surface runoff by more than 10%. Additionally, owners will not be responsible for improvements to any existing drainage conditions, except for those costs directly attributable to their incremental increases. I discussed this proposed change with Andrew Ausel (Associate Planner/UDO) and he seemed to concur that was a reasonable approach.   | The UDO is setting applicability thresholds that are simple to identify at an early stage of review. In many cases, this 10% surface runoff threshold would be more stringent than the current applicability threshold. In addition, to calculate the runoff from the project would require that a property owner hire a design professional to determine if they are subject to the requirements.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater  | Article 25       | page 25-3, 4 & 5<br>added statement of BUA to 25.3 #D 1, D 2, E. 1, E 2, F1, F2<br>Added sentence is incorrect. A more correct sentence is:<br>"Stormwater controls shall only be required for the amount of impervious surface being created that exceeds the amount of impervious surface that existed before the development or redevelopment [G.S. 143-214.7(b3)]".<br><br>Also, unless you include (b3) in the UDO you are not complying with state law...note the last sentence of that state law:<br>"(b3) Stormwater runoff rules and programs shall not require private property owners to install new or increased stormwater controls for (i) preexisting development or (ii) redevelopment activities that do not remove or decrease existing stormwater controls. When a preexisting development is redeveloped, either in whole or in part, increased stormwater controls shall only be required for the amount of impervious surface being created that exceeds the amount of impervious surface that existed before the redevelopment. This subsection applies to all local governments regardless of the source of their regulatory authority. Local governments shall include the requirements of this subsection in their stormwater ordinances."<br><br>I think the appropriate place for the (b3) sentence is under Article 25.2 A" | The UDO requires projects to comply with this state law by reference. The law does not specify how this requirement shall be written within local ordinances. To provide greater clarity, the UDO will be more specific to include a reference to G.S. 143-214.7.  | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater  | Article 27       | page 27-22 Definition of FPE<br>I've talked to Daryl Hammock about this definition and the intent to change the +2' back to +1' when new maps are approved. the definition is not correct. He says the language needs to be altered to be correct in what the Council approved in December 2021.<br>please provide the corrected language  | This definition will be revised to provide greater clarity by altering the sentence structure and making minor changes to wording.   | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page       | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater                                  | Article 24             | <p>page 24-1 drainage applicability section 24.2 Permit requirements<br/>City can not require storm plan &amp; SW permit when I just got one by virtue of an approved Preliminary Plan. Need to say an approved subdivision plan is an approval.<br/>I was told that this section is to 'get' the existing homeowners not to put a 2nd requirement on Land Development projects that just got approval<br/>Need to exclude vege garden, fire pits and farming/ plant cultivation as they do no increase BUA even though they alter topography.<br/>Suggest a sentence be added before items a, b, c, &amp; d that says "An approved Preliminary Plan qualifies as a permit and no additional permits are required for items A, B, C and D"</p>   | <p>The intent is not to require an additional drainage submittal. However, individual plot plans with house and driveway locations would be required.</p> <p>In addition, mentioning these activities as exempt could allow more impactful projects that alter the site drainage without a review. Where these types of projects do not impact site drainage, they would be permitted without a complex review.</p>   | No                       |
| 6/28/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater                                  | Article 23             | <p>Article 23 - This article gives the impression that only the lakes mentioned are protected. What about Reedy Creek and all the tributaries that run off of it? Is there more info on that somewhere?</p>  | <p>Article 23 specifically applies to areas draining to lakes that provide drinking water supply to the community. The streams and lakes within those areas are protected as described in this article. Articles 25 and 26 will provide protection for streams and surface water quality within the rest of the City's jurisdiction (including Reedy Creek watershed).</p>  | No                       |
| 6/28/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater                                  | Article 28             | <p>Article 28 - Soil Erosion Control - Has there been any discussion about developers NOT removing every square inch of top soil? Aside from the environmental impact, it seems like a huge waste of labor/money to just go back and plant grass/trees/shrubs in the dry, unhealthy dirt that is left behind. Obviously, when land is cleared for development, they have plans already done, so why not leave the areas that will be "decorative" and/or that won't have impervious materials added.</p>   | <p>There are sensitive areas (i.e. tree save, stream buffers) where grading is restricted to preserve the natural ecology and topsoil. Staff will consider this improvement for future versions of the UDO, however it will not be included in this iteration.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part IX. Stormwater                                  | pages 25-3, 25-4, 25-5 | <p>standards section (by each drainage basin) needs corrections to the section about 'methodology established in the Design Manual' as that Manual is not in compliance with (G.S. 143-214.7).<br/>GS 143-214.7 (a1)(1) states: "When additional development occurs at a site that has existing development, the built-up area of the existing development shall not be included in the density calculations for additional stormwater control requirements...". The current BUA calculation methodology in the Design Manual not only includes existing impervious in the density calculation, it attempts to distinguish from existing impervious "to remain" from existing impervious to be removed. State statute does not allow for this distinction. Provide evidence that the Design Manual is consistent with the state Law.<br/>The UDOO and the Design Manual need to both match the law</p>   | <p>Staff has reviewed this design manual with the City Attorney's Office and has confirmed it is compliant with state law.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/24/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 33             | <p>Sidewalks - The current prioritization of sidewalks along major roads should be reconsidered. Sidewalks in neighborhoods should be given first priority especially those with good sidewalk coverage, in general, but that have missing connector sidewalks. Connecting neighbors and neighborhoods make people healthier mentally and physically, make neighborhoods safer, create connectiveness and community, provide a higher happiness score, and increase the value of property in the area. Walkable streets attract businesses which offer employment. Walking means less cars and school buses which means less climate change and lowers the need for new roads and repairs. Sidewalks are also the most equitable mode of transportation - everyone can use a sidewalk; you don't have to purchase anything to use it. (1 of 4)</p>   | <p>The UDO sets forth multiple scenarios for when sidewalks are required, such as with new subdivisions, as mandated through a Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR), as supporting infrastructure for when new Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) bus stops may be required, etc.</p> <p>The UDO does not, however, set the policy and / or prioritization for when sidewalk projects are funded through Community Investment Plans (CIPs) or constructed / completed through street corridors.</p> <p>As with many pieces of the UDO, sidewalks, and the requirements for them, will continue to be evaluated as part of the UDO into the future.</p> | No                       |
| 6/24/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | 33 (ight not be exact) | <p>The following excerpt is from a listed source below. It emphasizes connecting neighborhoods from within; not major streets -</p> <p>At the outset of a sidewalk construction program, prioritize where to build first by focusing on a quarter mile circle around schools, parks, transit stops and key commercial destinations. Everything within that circle should be a priority for sidewalk construction. Be sure to map sidewalks so they're connected between the primary areas where people work, shop and play.</p> <p>At the recent UDO informational opportunity at the Government Center, I was given the argument that people in neighborhoods with lower traffic volume can walk on the road instead of having sidewalks. Reality - People do not want to walk on the road or in what is perceived to be a neighbor's private property, especially with children and dogs. (2 of 4)</p> | <p>The UDO sets forth multiple scenarios for when sidewalks are required, such as with new subdivisions, as mandated through a Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR), as supporting infrastructure for when new Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) bus stops may be required, etc.</p> <p>The UDO does not, however, set the policy and / or prioritization for when sidewalk projects are funded through Community Investment Plans (CIPs) or constructed / completed through street corridors.</p> <p>As with many pieces of the UDO, sidewalks, and the requirements for them, will continue to be evaluated as part of the UDO into the future.</p> | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 6/24/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 33       | <p>This is an unacceptable answer. I was also told there is limited money for sidewalks. Given the myriad of benefits of walkability, sidewalks should have government allocations from the budgets of transportation, health and safety, education, climate change, police, etc. and from the private sector. Builders of single and multi-family homes should be required to install sidewalks. This needs to be included in the UDO.</p> <p>Bottom line - The current sidewalk placement prioritization requirements and how they are funded need to be seriously reviewed and changed. The mindset of the importance of sidewalks and what gets prioritized needs to be rethought. The arguments are outdated and unfounded. This would be a win, win, win. (3 of 4)</p> | <p>The UDO sets forth multiple scenarios for when sidewalks are required, such as with new subdivisions, as mandated through a Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR), as supporting infrastructure for when new Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) bus stops may be required, etc.</p> <p>The UDO does not, however, set the policy and / or prioritization for when sidewalk projects are funded through Community Investment Plans (CIPs) or constructed / completed through street corridors.</p> <p>As with many pieces of the UDO, sidewalks, and the requirements for them, will continue to be evaluated as part of the UDO into the future.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/24/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 33       | <p>Several Sources:<br/><a href="https://www.keflatwork.com/blog/sidewalks-add-value-community/">https://www.keflatwork.com/blog/sidewalks-add-value-community/</a><br/><br/><a href="https://legistarweb-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/attachment/pdf/334359/Attachment__3_-_One_excerpt_from_an_attached_source_says:ik_in_the_street_on_low_traffic_neighborhood_streets_is_not_true_and_not_safe.Sidewalk_Factsheets.pdf">https://legistarweb-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/attachment/pdf/334359/Attachment__3_-_One_excerpt_from_an_attached_source_says:ik_in_the_street_on_low_traffic_neighborhood_streets_is_not_true_and_not_safe.Sidewalk_Factsheets.pdf</a><br/>(4 of 4)</p>  | <p>The UDO sets forth multiple scenarios for when sidewalks are required, such as with new subdivisions, as mandated through a Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR), as supporting infrastructure for when new Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) bus stops may be required, etc.</p> <p>The UDO does not, however, set the policy and / or prioritization for when sidewalk projects are funded through Community Investment Plans (CIPs) or constructed / completed through street corridors.</p> <p>As with many pieces of the UDO, sidewalks, and the requirements for them, will continue to be evaluated as part of the UDO into the future.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 32       | <p>page 32-1 removed TDM but left it in the CTR. why? If it's in the CTR it should be acknowledged in the UDO</p>  | <p>Section 32.1.A, under Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR), makes reference to both Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Traffic Impact Studies (TIS), and these are both contained within CTR as part of the Charlotte Streets Manual.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 32       | <p>page 32-6 section 32.5 A. required new streets<br/>Not all subdivisions in 30.3.A require a new street (a Minor Subdivision for example) and clearly the construction of a principal structure is not likely to demonstrate a need for a new road to be constructed. This #A needs to be changed</p>  | <p>The draft UDO includes proposed modifications and adjustments provisions to ensure requirements are proportional. An example of this flexibility can be found in Section 32.2. A key component of this requirement is a proposed development site must be of the size that would trigger the requirement for a new street.</p>  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 32       | <p>page 32-7 required off-street public paths<br/>where does the required path go? not defined in Streets Map Manual. Article 33 only refers to a Transit Trail. Definition says: greenways, transit trails, off-street trail connections, and bicycle and pedestrian connections. But requirement is not obvious when or where one would be required.</p>   | <p>Off-street public paths may be: transit trails, greenway trails, or connections to off-street public paths or parks.</p> <p>In two instances, should the path be of a transit or greenway trail form, the path may be part of a larger public path and / or park system. In the instance of the connection, the path serves the express purpose of connecting the street network to a park or off-street public path (such as an existing transit or greenway trail).</p> <p>The applicability of the required off-street public paths is found at Section 32.6.A, with further specification found at Section 32.6.C.1 for transit trails, Section 32.6.D for greenway trails, and Section 32.6.E.1 for connections to off-street public paths or parks.</p> | No                       |



| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 1        | Section 1 Charlotte Street map page 4 to 10<br>page 4 should include acknowledgement that certain facilities listed are prohibited in NCDOT roads (especially in the ETJ). The UDO acknowledgements do not carry over the separate document. Note should be on page 4 or on every line item for pedestrian facilities, planting strip/amenity zone, and bike facilities. These should not require a variance since we know today that NCDOT controls new and existing roads in ETJ and will not allow most pedestrian facilities, planting strip/amenity zone, and bike facilities. | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 1        | Section 1 Charlotte Street map<br>Table 1.3<br>table does not include Uptown street type  | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 1        | Section 1 Charlotte Street map<br>page 4 #1 and # 6 we don't have street trees in the UDO, they are now called Frontage trees   | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 2        | Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design<br>Schools<br>fix the typo. The correct statute is 160A-307.1 not 60A-307.1   | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 2        | Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design<br>item B page 15 infers SF driveway review (in conflict with UDO section 31.3)<br>correct the intro paragraph to say: "To ensure safe and efficient operation, CDOT will review non-single family driveway/access points based upon their location relative to other features (such as intersections, other driveways and property lines). In addition to UDO section 31.3 the following section outlines requirements for driveway locations."  | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 2        | Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design<br>2.3 Driveway Design Table 2.2<br>type II driveway LDSM # 10.26 does not exist, What reference is correct?  | Thank you for this feedback. This question pertains not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022.              | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 3        | Section 3 CTR<br>3.2 C Mitigations / Fee-in-lieu<br>new section C does not indicate that fee in lieu can only be accessed (at that undetermined rate-- which needs to be known before this document is approved) for improvements the City can legally require.<br>we don't want this section to be a way to hide that you are illegally requiring offsite improvements<br>Case law is TAC Stafford, LLC v Mooresville and Buckland v. Haws River   | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 3        | Section 3 CTR<br>3.3 C page 23<br>Item C and Table 3.3 do not specifically say (but it should) that the Mitigation options are only determined by the proposed INCREASE in pedestrian impacts and the improvements/ mitigations can only be installed on the property (not offsite- see TAC Stafford LLC v. Town of Mooresville)  | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022. | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 3        | Section 3 CTR<br>Table 3.4<br>how in this document do you ascertain what the potential points will be for TDM mitigation?   | Thank you for this feedback. This question pertains not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022.              | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 3        | Section 3 CTR Table 3.4<br>Points attributed to different TDM Options are not equal and should better align with the benefit and cost. For example, an onsite shower facility is very expensive and a bike repair station is not the same cost.  | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 06/27/2022.  | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 31       | Need special provisions for seniors who are aging in place for additional driveways around back for easy access in their two story homes. I need a second driveway around back because my kitchen and bedrooms are upstairs. I have 10 steps from the front of the home to upstairs.   | There are no requirements, nor prohibitions, on second driveways or driveway extensions to the rear of dwellings. If a property can accommodate such extra driveway space it can be developed as long as any other applicable development provisions, such as built-upon area / impervious surface, can be met.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Article 31       | Are there any special provisions for second driveways for those elderly Residents who may need a driveway around back to stay in place and may also need a handicap ramp? I will need a second driveway around back because my kitchen and bedrooms are upstairs.  | There are no requirements, nor prohibitions, on second driveways or driveway extensions to the rear of dwellings. If a property can accommodate such extra driveway space it can be developed as long as any other applicable development provisions, such as built-upon area / impervious surface, can be met.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | 31.2             | cross access needs and administrative path for staff approval if it doesn't make sense in the context of surrounding properties or street network, or other physical or environmental limitations exist (similar to subdivision ordinance exception to block length 31.D)  | Section 32.2 and Table 32-1 allow for cross-access adjustments - See the first item listed in the table.  | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | 32.7.B.3         | relocation of existing curb and gutter. item (i) is confusing, is this stating anytime a CTR is required the curb must be relocated? which part of the CTR as there are 3 sections with triggers? does this give CDOT the ability to request relocation in every CTR negotiation? also confused on what approval of a subdivision indicates to trigger relocation of a curb  | No, the intent for relocation of curb and gutter is not merely having to go through a CTR but when the results of the CTR requires such installation / relocation. Staff will correct the language to better clarify.<br><br>Reference relocation due to subdivision approval, this would apply to new subdivision approval in areas where already existing curb and gutter may not already be in its future back-of-curb location. The multiple exceptions to this requirement are detailed through the language found starting at Section 32.7.C.3.b. | Yes                      |
| 6/29/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | Section 33.3     | Section 33.3 - need ability for CDOT Director to modify street section with a rezoning. i would suggest items such as on-street parking, lane widths, and streetscape can be staff level approvals based on specific site constraints (such as preserving existing building, or old non maintained r/w with no existing or future connectivity benefit).   | Street cross sections will be able to be modified through EX rezoning approval.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | 30.8.E.1         | 30.8.E.1 - Remove "Highway" from title. It should be NCDOT District Engineer.  | Staff will make this correction.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure | 32.1             | 32.1 Comprehensive transportation Review - this section is light and I understand that the Charlotte Streets Manual is also under comment period so the comments for 32.1 are for both the UDO and the CTR. Page numbers refer to CTR in the Charlotte Streets Manual: P. 20 Multimodal Analysis and TDM are not something that RLAs learn in school nor is it listed in NCGS 89A, the only engineering an RLA is allowed to do is "arrangement of land"; remove reference to landscape designers being eligible to perform this work. P 22 talks about assessing deficiencies in the multimodal but where is the requirement to provide offsite mitigation, add language that specifies some mitigation may be offsite. P 23 Unclear what solid waste collection has to do with multimodal and it is allowed the most mitigation points, understand that trash cans get in the way of sidewalks but this seems random and out of place. P 23 & 26 Transit is not listed as a mitigation, add a transit section to include waiting pads, seats, benches and shelters. P 25 Active Transportation strategies - a bike repair station is much cheaper than showers, consider giving showers more mitigation points. P 27 mentions alternative mitigation but does not clearly state how to design for impacts of roadway widenings or what alt mitigation is. Overall the CTR does not adequately address impacts to environmental justice communities. For example, widening out intersections and increased traffic makes crossing the street more difficult and waiting at bus stops uncomfortable. The TIS portion should include a connectivity analysis (are new streets needed) and conformance with local area plans or community area plans (requirement to analyze streets that the City plans to add) | Thank you for these comments and feedback. These remarks pertain not to the UDO but to the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Manual project - an initiative of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This feedback has been shared with, and referred to, the Streets Manual team at CDOT as of 07/01/2022.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part   | UDO Section/Page                             | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.4.C.                                      | 32.4.C. new bus stop - reference trips in CTR but CTR does not address new bus stops. Consider closing this loop by specifying the trips as was in the prior draft or including new bus stops requirement in the CTR.   | UDO staff have worked with our teammates at the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) to craft amended language adding clarity to this standard.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.4.C.2.c.                                  | 32.4.C.2.c. Consider adding schools, daycares, colleges, etc. to list of non-exempt uses. For many, transportation is a barrier to getting their kid into a great school or daycare.  | Thank you for this comment. Staff will add these uses to the non-exempt uses for the referenced section.   | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.5.E                                       | 32.5.E Collectors: commercial collectors are also important but not addressed in this section; commercial collectors serve an important multimodal need and many require bike lanes or side paths where a local street might not. Add thresholds for commercial collector status.   | All collectors, whether they be more residential or commercial corridors, are to be constructed if they are shown on the Charlotte Streets Map. The Streets Map does not differentiate collectors by residential or commercial status. Additionally, the provision of Section 32.5.E.2.b would likely capture the scenario referenced if the street served the function of a collector.  | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.6.C&D                                     | 32.6.C&D - 18-month is not enough time for staff and the developer to come to an agreement; it is easy for the developer to stall so that the requirement is lifted. The UDO should make it a requirement for developer to build/dedicate the trail/greenway to reduce the infrastructure burden on taxpayers   | The 18-month reservation period is based on recommendations from the City Attorney's Office, the reservation period in the current Subdivision Ordinance, and guidance from North Carolina General Statutes.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.6.E                                       | 32.6.E Thank you for this section!! I had to read it a few times to get it, but I'm glad it's in there and appreciate the graphics.   | Thank you for this statement of support.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part X. Subdivision, Streets, & Other Infrastructure   | 32.7.D.4                                     | 32.7.D.4 Constrained space in streetscape: "less than 4' available" then "sidewalk/SUP is not required." This exemption must be removed!! We are in an era where eliminating sidewalk is not equitable to all users of the transportation system. Rather, reduce vehicle lane widths, median widths, or turn lanes to acquire the needed minimum width for at least sidewalk to be installed.   | It is the city's goal going forward to not have sidewalks less than six feet in width to safely accommodate pedestrians, as per Table 33-4. As such, staff is of the opinion that requiring sidewalks less than this standard is contradictory to the tenets of that goal. However, it should be noted that in these constrained space scenarios in which remaining streetscape width is less than four feet there is the option to completely hardscape these areas. Hardscaping these areas would likely making them passable for pedestrians. | No                       |
| 6/3/2022  | Part XI. Administration through Part XIII. Enforcement | 37.9 Development Review and Approval Process | On page 37-35, section 37.9 "Development Review and Approval Processes" is extremely open-ended and vague. It doesn't explain or provide where to find the procedures and practices that are established by the city. My main concern: what ability do citizens have to access and review site plans that are in the approval process? If a citizen believes that a site plan will have a materially negative impact on their community, what channel do they have to express that to the city? Given the UDO is a new document, there are likely to be many unintended consequences or oversights. By not providing citizens access to the permitting and development approval process, those oversights may not be revealed until it is too late. | Citizen review of conventional and conditional zoning map amendments is provided in the UDO and includes a community meeting process. Rezoning petitions can be viewed online. Citizens can speak to Council members at the public hearing regarding conventional and conditional rezonings. Submittals for administrative approvals, such as permits, subdivisions, etc., are available online through ACCELA on the CLT Development Center website.  | No                       |
| 6/22/2022 | Part XI. Administration through Part XIII. Enforcement | 37.2   | Will 37.2 be handled like a rezoning is handled now?  | Yes, the new term to align with NCGS 160D is zoning map amendment.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | Part XI. Administration through Part XIII. Enforcement | Article 36                                   | page 36-1 Written Interpretations<br>36.2 C. Written Interpretation need to be available online not hidden in a notebook or file folder. Interpretations should be able to be searched with OCR software (ex. Is Adobe Acrobat). Written interpretations apply to all properties and need to be public information for all property owners  | Written interpretations will be public information. The request to place written interpretations online will be forwarded to the UDO administrators.   | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part  | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|---|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/27/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | Article 37       | page 37-31 Erosion Control Fines<br>Per N.C. Gen. Stat. 113A-64, only the Secretary or a local government are authorized to assess penalties. Per N.C. Gen. Stat. 113A-64 violators may contest an assessment. A contested case proceeding is an administrative remedy for the violator to appeal the penalty that was assessed. Increasing the amount of a penalty when it is appealed is not a decision on the penalty that was assessed, it is assessing a new penalty, and is not consistent with statute.   | Page 37-31 deals with Soil Erosion Appeals, not fines. Section 39-13 addresses Soil Erosion Fines. Yes, a local government is authorized to assess penalties.<br><br>Appeals for Soil Erosion are discussed in Section 37.8.B.6.c, and is consistent with state statutes. The UDO staff has reviewed these requirements with the City Attorney's Office.<br><br>NCGS 113A-64 does not mention that a penalty may not be increased, and that increasing the penalty is assessing a new penalty.<br><br>NCGS Chapter 160D-406(j), reads, "An appeal board may modify the decision appealed from and shall make any order, requirement, decision, or determination that ought to be made. The board shall have all powers of the official who made the decision. If the administrator could have imposed greater penalties, so may the board." | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | 37.2             | confused in our historical conditional zoning map amendment will still exist (2); or if every rezoning will be (3) EX? there is more limited deviations in the EX district AND the public benefits required might not be able to be achieved on ever size an scale project. what about a simple tweak of dimensional standard for a small business on a small parcel? inconsistency in the ordinance that is not site specific or waiting on a future text amendment to clean up? there should be some 'minor' conditional zonings allowed to be processed without public benefits required. | Properties with a conditional zoning district will retain their zoning district designations and approved site plan conditions, and remain in effect under the zoning ordinance standards in place at the time of adoption of the conditional zoning district. However, all conditionally zoned sites will be considered for alignment zoning after the UDO goes into effect. Most alignment zoning will occur in conjunction with the community area planning process.<br><br>Conditional rezonings will be an option in the future and will not be replaced by EX zoning. Only EX conditional zoning map amendments require public benefits.<br><br>Administrative Adjustments for quantitative zoning standards, of up to 10%, may permitted with Zoning Administrator approval. Variances may be pursued for hardship conditions.       | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | 37.6             | I have concerns with uncertainty for vesting of existing conditional rezoning plans that need to rely upon the site-specific plans and zoning regulations in existence at the time of approval. (Part I)   | Approved conditional rezoning plans (site-specific plans) are vested at the time of approval for 2 years unless an extended period was requested. Vesting for a conditional rezoning will expire at the end of the vesting period with respect to buildings and uses for which no valid building permit applications have been filed. Even if vesting has expired, a conditional rezoning plan will remain in effect until the zoning for the property is changed. This will be clarified in the next draft.<br><br>In addition, common law vesting could apply. Common law vesting establishes the right to undertake and complete the development and use of property where substantial expenditure of resources are made in good faith and the expenditures were made in reliance on a valid development permit or development approval. | Yes                      |

| Date      | UDO Part  | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment   | Staff Response  | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|---|------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 6/30/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | 37.6             | Staff has indicated recently that existing CD plans will remain valid and may rely upon zoning regulations in place at time of rezoning adoption. But the 2nd draft deleted wording to this effect, most notably Section 1.4C, so we need confirmation on this critical point. (Part II)   | The adoption of the UDO will not change zoning for conditionally zoned sites. A conditional rezoning plan for a property will remain valid until the zoning for the property changes. As long as the conditional plan is valid, the zoning standards for the zoning ordinance in effect at the time of approval will be used. This includes all other development standards and ordinances in place at the time of approval. This will be clarified in the next draft.<br><br>After the vesting for a conditional rezoning plan expires, an alignment rezoning, initiated by staff and designed to align zoning with a property's place type, may be proposed.  | Yes                      |
| 6/30/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | 37.6             | Recent discussions with Staff pointed to a need for similar reliance of CD plans & development approvals based on existing subdivision/street design, stormwater, and tree ordinances since these plans and development approvals were also prepared/approved with the current ordinances in mind. The UDO needs to contain appropriate vesting/transition rules for these items as well. (Part III)   | Approved conditional rezoning plans and other development approvals each have a specific vesting period. Conditional rezoning plans are vested for 2 years unless a longer (up to 5 year) vesting period was approved by City Council. A preliminary subdivision plan is vested for a period of 3 years allowing the developer to begin construction. Other development permit approvals are vested for a period of 12 months from the date an application was filed. As long as the vesting period remains valid, the regulations and ordinances existing at the time of approval or from when an application was filed, will be used.<br><br>See above for information on applicable regulations after expiration of vesting for CD rezoning plans. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | Part XI.<br>Administration<br>through Part XIII.<br>Enforcement | 37.6             | Finally, please confirm in the UDO or policy that conditional zoning plans submitted prior to 12/31/2022 and development approval plans submitted for review prior to effective date of UDO next year will remain governed by current zoning and other regulations. (Part IIII)  | This is not found in the UDO itself, but in a separate Ordinance that Council will consider, in conjunction with the UDO adoption. The separate proposed ordinance to adopt the UDO includes information on how applications for conditional zoning plans will be addressed once the UDO is adopted. Staff proposes that conditional rezoning applications for a zoning map amendment to a pre-UDO zoning district will be accepted by City staff and processed under the pre-UDO zoning regulations, if a complete application is filed by 2-1-23, even if the decision is made after the effective date (proposed to be 6-1-23). However, the decision must occur no later than March 1, 2024.  | No                       |
| 6/16/2022 | General UDO   | Global Comment   | We need more great urban parks in Charlotte. I'm no expert on how to include this in the UDO, but Charlotte really lags behind other cities I've lived in when it comes to urban parks, or sometimes I've seen them called "pocket parks". Please look for a way to ensure we get more of these. Thanks!   | The UDO includes new park provisions  | No                       |
| 6/16/2022 | General UDO   | Global Comment   | Please make sure the connectivity improves! We are too limited on our means of getting around. Also, prioritize transit!   | The intent of the standards in the Subdivision, Streets, and Other Infrastructure Articles is to support these goals.   | No                       |
| 6/27/2022 | General UDO   | Global Comment   | beginning on page 2-2 the word is Townhouse. but 6 times the term is Townhome. Do a word search and correct the inconsistency  | This will be corrected.   | Yes                      |
| 6/27/2022 | General UDO   | Global Comment   | UDO-General Comments: Document Usability: A public document like this UDO, created in 2022, should have industry standard basic usability formatting and function built into any published document. At a minimum, cross-references hyperlinked, Parts, Articles bookmarked and terms that are defined hyperlinked. It is incredibly difficult from a user standpoint to navigate this draft document and it inhibits a clear understanding of the interconnected parts. | These changes will be made for the adopted document.  | No                       |

| Date      | UDO Part    | UDO Section/Page | Public Comment  | Staff Response   | Recommend Change to UDO? |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 6/29/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | Would like to see a strategy from the city to increase trash and recycling receptacles throughout the City. Potentially would like to see a bonus program to incentivize developers in putting in public trash and recycling services on their street facing properties.  | Staff supports a strategy to increase trash and recycling receptacles. However, without having an overarching strategy, staff does not feel it is appropriate to add standards to the UDO.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | In support of the EV charging stations through development but would also like to see a strategy from the City to increase public EV charging stations.   | Staff will forward your comment on the request for a strategy to increase public EV charging stations to the Office of Sustainability.   | No                       |
| 6/29/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | Would like to see more strategies for increasing alternative methods of transportation including but not limited to: new light rail lines; safe bike paths; more greenways; pedestrian walkways and better infrastructure for sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.   | On June 27, 2022 the Charlotte City Council adopted the Strategic Mobility Plan (SMP). Goals of the SMP include providing for safe and equitable mobility, increasing mobility/micromobility options, and reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips to 50% of all commuting trips by 2040. | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | Please reconsider this plan. My concerns have to do with maintaining community feel in neighborhoods, preserving tree canopy and green spaces. I feel that the city just does whatever it wants without regard for the consequences much like the decision to allow people to essentially pave their entire yards and put in pools and consider that in keeping with the 65/35% plan. It feels hopeless as everything is in the City's control and I don't feel that we often want to consider alternatives. I welcome ideas that would effectively increase affordable housing in our expensive city.  | Staff believes that the draft UDO includes a number of new standards that address the issues that have been identified, including the new neighborhood character overlay, new heritage tree and green area standards, and multiple new standards to support affordable housing.          | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | I have 3 questions that affect the entire document.<br><br>1) Why does the document not have an index?<br><br>Indexes are particularly valuable to new users of the document because they allow users to search the document in the order that their mind works as opposed to the fixed/rigid/unchangeable form that reflects the thinking of the documents creator. An index would save users 1000s of hours of time over the course of becoming familiar with the document. (Part I)  | Staff will consider the addition of an index for the final document. Creation of an index for a draft document that has multiple drafts and changes with each draft has not been feasible.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | 2) Why does the document not contain hyperlinks?<br><br>Hyperlinks between sections of the document would increase its usability by several orders of magnitude. When a user encountered an unfamiliar term, the link would provide them with an immediate method to navigate to the section of the document that provided further explanation. Particularly for users who are viewing the document online, scrolling (perhaps 100s of pages) to search for the correct elaborative text is just an intellectual impedance to could easily be overcome by using hyperlinks. Hyperlinks allow users to view the document in a manner that is tightly aligned with their thought process. (Part II)   | Staff agrees and the final document will include hyperlinks.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | 3) why is the document only available in a printed-page format?<br><br>I'm sure many people will print a copy of the UDO and use that formatting to accomplish their work. However, I believe that a lot of people would prefer to view the document on some form of digital display, be it an iPhone, and iPad or a laptop/desktop device. None of these devices is an 8.5 by 11 in sheet of paper. Reading document on screen is generally less efficient than reading a piece of paper, however, when the documents are formatted to fit the device display the difference in readability disappear almost completely. Software to author documents to simultaneously fit both online and print media is readily available.<br>I am making these comments because I believe that one part of making the development process easier is creating documents that are easy to use. A document that is physically formatted to be used in 1972 may not be the most effective thing to put forth in 2022. I don't want the UDO to be like necessary medicine stored in a child-proof bottle that an elderly person would struggle to open.<br><br>I believe that a small amount of effort to address the questions I listed above will result in 1000s of hours of time being saved by the development community over the life of the document... and that is a win-win for everyone. (Part III) | Staff will address this concern in the final document.   | No                       |
| 6/30/2022 | General UDO | Global Comment   | I would recommend a formalized group/committee be established to meet on a regular basis prior to the effective date of the ordinance to identify additional challenges with the document and its implementation. This group would then recommend a corrective text amendment and/or amendments for Council consideration in April/May 2023. I would also recommend that in addition to amendments along the way, a specified date after effectiveness that this group/committee working with City Staff provide a report to City Council with suggestions for any additional changes to the UDO.   | Staff supports convening a diverse group to discuss potential changes to the UDO after adoption, with the group's focus on changes with policy implications. Staff also favors developing a process for addressing technical changes.  | No                       |