

TOD-A Comments as of 3-26-18	Comment Date	Topic
Should there be a mention of affordable housing? Wouldnt these site by definition be preferable for affordable housing given the TOD nature?	3/7/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Affordability should be part of the purpose of having this zoning designation. It is of prime importance to the support of our transit investment. We must be intentional about this is we truly want it to happen.	3/7/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
At the end of the first sentence add more pedestrian and bicycle friendly focus to this language	3/7/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Create an overlay district that applies this zoning to all of the specific parcels that currently meet the TOD Applicability Statement	3/7/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
<p>I need to dig into the details to see if this has been addressed, but TOD has always been hampered by what I call the bulls eye plan. The height can be really tall, but a single family house 5 blocks away restricts the height. In plan review, we show concentric rings out from this house showing the height restrictions, as seen below:</p> <p>This has always been the major impediment to TOD zonings, that a house no where near the subject parcel can restrict the heights. On this project, the house was across south blvd, down the street. Height would not significantly such a remote use. This is almost always an issue since the transit line is linear, cutting through single family developments on either side, just a block or two away.</p> <p>If you really want to encourage height, this restriction needs to be removed.</p>	3/7/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
<p>The purpose of the TOD-A seems about right, but I am curious about the other 3 "TODs". If TOD-A is for rapid transit stations, are the other for "not at transit stations"? Can they be a mile away? If so then they have no "T" for their TOD. I await in rapt anticipation.</p> <p>I you should consider adopting the LEED-ND standard, which does include location criteria. Or possibly call it "LEED-LIKE"</p>	3/8/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Having a form based code is a good process that helps streamline the entitlements. Density should be pushed to areas immediately adjacent to the light rail and infrastructure projects.	3/12/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
If we are not going to say affordable housing explicitly then we ought to talk about a a diversity of incomes and employment opportunities	3/13/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Very wishy-washy, too much typical "policy language -- "encourage", "intended". These are, or should be rules. Instead of "encourage", -- "require".	3/19/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
single family zoning - clarify zoning district or use. often these are not the same.	3/19/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
how can they be modified - by staff? council? what freedom for decision and application are allowed and by who?	3/19/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
a link to the MTC station plan would be helpful.	3/19/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
does this apply only to the trains or to the trolley as well?	3/19/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Please clarify how the 1/4 mile distance will be measured. Is this distance to be a radius or by pedestrian travel. A radiused distance will include far more parcels than by pedestrian travel. The current University City Station Plans only account for a 1/4 by pedestrian travel, which limits the the applicability of this policy.	3/20/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
<p>Recognizing that I have not having seen the TOD-B purpose, applicability, or proposed locations; it seems that the TOD-A District would be appropriate in all urban areas. It also seems that the TOD-C could accommodate "edge" urban areas. We really should have maximum density around urban mass transit nodes.</p> <p>Under Applicability, consider revising the sentence, "This distance may be modified to accommodate..." to "This distance shall extend to include..."</p>	3/21/2018	Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>TOD-A District Applicability  TOD-A may be applied to lots within 1/4 of a mile of an existing rapid transit station.  -University City Station outside of road (PID 04918104) these properties are 1/4 mile from the station but the entire parcel abuts to single family. So it seems that TOD-A would not be allowed, but would it be allowed if this was 2 parcels "a front and a back?"  -Tom Hunter Station (PID 04905605) There is an Utility Easement between the single family and the parcel "does that mean TOD-A is ok."  -Sugar Creek Station "Between North Tyron and the Rail line is a 1/2 mile" there is no single family, the area is ideal for TOD-A. So why are we limiting TOD-A to a 1/4 mile? Where did 1/4 mile come from? This seem just to be an arbitrary distance.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Page 1 - District definition &amp; Applicability: In addition to station areas, the prescriptions in this ordinance will be applicable in other places (place types) as well. For example, the guidelines will be applicable in corridors served by other transit modes (streetcar, BRT and bus), in high volume vehicular corridors and in some existing and future neighborhood or activity centers and major intersections. Therefore, the 'places' within 1/4 mile of a transit station would be just one of several types. The name of this ordinance could be changed to 'Pedestrian Oriented Development' or POD to reflect this. The condition that this ordinance guides is mostly about guiding 'high density'...wherever it may be...including transit stations.   Also...this may be a bit picky in the early stages of ordinance development BUT....i think you apply graphic design principles and elements to make this easier to read.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The TOD zoning district cannot be used along the LYNX Gold Line (Streetcar) because West Trade/Beatties Ford road is not recognized as a transit corridor under current land use policy and land development regulations. TOD districts are can only be used along "rapid transit corridors" like the LYNX Blue Line located in South End and the Blue Line Extension to UNCC. Not including streetcar introduces inequity in the availability of economic development tools that allow higher density development at transit station areas.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Overall Comments  Is TOD-A required within 1/4 mile, or can other TOD B/C/D be allowed? Is this for all stations or just certain stations?  - Based on comment above, generally TOD-A makes sense in South End, but worry in other districts (Independence, Airport, North East,etc) it will not be appropriate with scale, design stds. , etc.  - Entire draft appears crafted towards south end or uptown, is this envisioned to be used in other areas of charlotte?  -Has affordability been assessed and impacts on affordable housing (specifically architectural material requirements)  -Lack of allowances, definition, or variance for adaptive re-use (majority of requirements would preclude using existing buildings and require tear down).  -General concern of the compliance and policing of this policy. Will new staff be hired that have an architectural background? Similar bonus point systems in Durham and Charleston have struggled with compliance and achieving desired results (specifically affordable housing) "have you talked with staff and developers in those regions to get feedback on their systems?"  -More prescriptive requirements can't fix bad architectural design, no matter how hard you try, and many great projects in charlotte could not be built under these standards (Camden Gallery, 1616 Center, Railyard, and so on)  TOD Districts Page 2  Backs study of TOD-A impact on other ordinances, for example how do revisions to tree ordinance, subdivision, PCSO, streets / sidewalks support the vision of this district.   Lack of definition and flexibility for re-use of existing buildings, need definition in every chapter and not just bonus section or design standards.  TOD bonuses should be exemptions / reductions / alternative approaches to solving the PCCO or Tree ordinance. If you meet all of the PLACE requirements, you get credits toward those requirements. Adaptive re-use of existing buildings could also have a PLACE point system the will credit toward those and/or subdivision requirements.  I am not sure that a height density bonus will be effective. Most TOD/urban developments now are limited in height based on construction costs and market demand, not ordinance requirements. The only place it come into effect via the ordinance is when we have a transition issue with an adjoining residential neighborhood. This draft states that TOD-A would not be used in those conditions. So, why should we have a building height issue to begin with? The only use that would push height would be office. The base TOD should be able to accommodate a 6 story building, or 5 over podium.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>how is the distance measured regarding sites within 1/4 mile of a station. How is the station area defined?</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Purpose Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

TOD should be mandatory if you're within 1/4 mile of a station.	2/7/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
How will TOD-A Place Type be assigned to light rail stations versus TOD-B, C, D, etc?	2/28/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Will UDO overlay our current myriad small/neighborhood/large/regional area plans or current zoning districts and maps? If so, when will these be updated?	2/28/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Why a 1/4 of a mile and not 1/2 mile?	3/7/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Create an overlay district that applies this zoning to all of the specific parcels that currently meet the TOD Applicability Statement	3/7/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
I feel as though a quarter mile radius just won't be enough to make a difference. If we want the area to have the population density to support pedestrian oriented neighborhoods and the light rail we have to allow more high density development. A half mile radius seems more appropriate. I also feel like the quarter mile radius could be extended to go along the rapid transit lines themselves to create more connection. Currently we will have small islands of density that would have no pedestrian connectivity other than taking the light rail (which isn't bad in itself). I would love to see a whole corridor along the line that promotes walking, biking, transit instead of just in a quarter mile radius around a few transit stations.	3/8/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
If we are going from dense to less dense I do not understand the prohibition abutting SF districts; this seems like naked politics and not planning. Would like to hear an explanation of why this does not discourage dense development around our very expensive community asset.	3/13/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
The fact that we have not previously critiqued "place types" makes this applicability too fuzzy. By now staff and consultants should know precise locations where they think this zoning will apply. It's time to be a lot more transparent so we can judge this applicability more accurately.	3/19/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
single family zoning - clarify zoning district or use. often these are not the same.	3/19/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
how can they be modified - by staff? council? what freedom for decision and application are allowed and by who?	3/19/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
a link to the MTC station plan would be helpful.	3/19/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
does this apply only to the trains or to the trolley as well?	3/19/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Please note the typo in the above response: "piously" was a spellcheck error. I can't delete it.	3/20/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Extremely disappointed with the Uses included in the TOD-A document. The Uses, as denoted are very restrictive and will prevent the very goals that were set out by the Purpose Statement. I also don't feel like these Uses were reviewed in the context of economic development. These Uses will essentially crush small and local businesses by making it too restrictive to operate effectively. Specific critiques of the uses will be included in the subsequent sections. Please provide clarification on the Discussion Note referencing Adult Uses. This note makes it contradictory as it seems like Adult Uses are prohibited and allowed. Please see the last sentence in this Discussion Note  Why are there "principal uses" and why are multiple principle uses allowed on the same site? (Please see section 1.d) This seems like an unnecessary division of the proposed ordinance. This verbiage also lends itself to all manner of interpretation for uses and projects that will be antithetical to the TOD-A ordinance goals.	3/20/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Can Planning Staff please confirm whether the 1/4 mile distance from the station is measured as a radius or in pedestrian travel time. The University City Area plan measured the 1/4 mile around its stations in pedestrian travel time. Please clarify due to the vast difference in the number of parcels that would be affected under a radius rather than travel time.	3/20/2018	Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>Under Applicability, consider revising the sentence, "This distance may be modified to accommodate..." to "This distance shall extend to include..."</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The LYNX Gold Line (Streetcar) is not recognized as a transit corridor under current land use policy and land development regulations. This omission introduces inequity in the availability of economic development tools, that allow high density development at transit station areas, like Transit Oriented Development, are not applicable to the transit station areas along the Gold Line Phase II which is also identified as a Distressed Business Corridor. The applicability of the TOD district is inconsistent with the land use vision in the West End Pedscape Plan and the LYNX Gold Line II Small Starts Land Use and Economic Development Report. This report specifies general policy statements supporting high density development and zoning changes in the corridor and transit station areas. In addition, the LYNX Gold Line Phase II's existing "Wedge" designation per Centers, Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework is also inconsistent with the Transit Oriented Development vision for Gold Line Phase II.</p> <p>In order to align policies and regulations with the Gold Line Phase II vision, amend the Zoning Ordinance to recognize streetcar as transit technology that can utilize the Transit Oriented Development zoning districts.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>How will 1/4 mile be measured? Suggest being more specific.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The lack of applicability of the TOD district is inconsistent with the land use vision for Historic West End as outlined in the West End Pedscape Plan and the LYNX Gold Line II Small Starts Land Use and Economic Development Report. These documents specify policy statements supporting high density development and zoning changes in the corridor and at transit station areas.</p> <p>To align policies and regulations with the vision for streetcar in Historic West End, amendments to the Zoning Ordinance MUST recognize streetcar as transit technology that can utilize the TOD zoning districts.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>1 TOD-A District Applicability multiple lots sometimes comprise a project, would recommend revising language to support a 'unified development plan' or project</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>how is the distance measured regarding sites within 1/4 mile of a station. How is the station area defined?</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Applicability Statement: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Not sure where this goes, but I think there would be a benefit if every TOD had a Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan. It should extend for at least 1, maybe 2-mile radius, from the station platform. It should be transparent, accept public input and be kept up-to-date.</p>	<p>3/11/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No surface parking lots! No one wants to walk through a parking lot! They kill walking! No surface parking! No convenient parking! No parking right by the door! No parking at a back entrance! No private parking! If people really think they need parking, make it communal, public, neighborhood-use parking the edge of the neighborhood! No convenient parking by the door! No surface parking that actively discourage walking! Make people walk to their destination! Make people want to use trains and buses to get in and out!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>I really think everything about uses must come AFTER the regulations about the urban form standards. The way it's structured now gives the wrong impression. Use it seems is still the paramount criterion.</p> <p>If we have learned anything in the past twenty years about how cities are best regulated it's that urban form is much more longer lasting than transitory uses. Therefore regulations on that vital issue must have priority over use.</p> <p>Doing it the way you have done it here says, not much has changed except a few design things at the end.</p> <p>Entirely the wrong message if I may say so.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The Prescribed Used section was one of the more frustrating section because of the over regulation and unnecessary additions to a zoning ordinance that is supposed to be simpler and less cumbersome. The Prescribed Uses as currently configured well negatively affect the city's economy. I seriously urge the planning department to review their assumptions on uses with the Economic Development office and business owners.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (c) Bicycle-Sharing: Please clarify why bicycle-sharing stations are limited to 52 feet? Also, please clarify why it is necessary to enshrine that level of specificity for bike-share into the zoning ordinance. (section (c).3.b.1 &amp; 2. The provision about whether the station is perpendicular or parallel to the street is also confusing.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (c) Bicycle-Sharing: Section (c).4 is unnecessary and contradictory to the Purpose Statements statement of the decreased reliance on motor vehicles. This section will actually ensure that bike share will NOT be part of TOD-A project, unless mandated. We need to encourage, rather than discourage bike share in what is supposed to be a "highly walkable neighborhood"</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (c) Bicycle-Sharing (c).4: Why are there Conditional Districts (CDs)? I thought the purpose of the zoning rewrite was to avoid this type of conditional, property based zoning system we have now. What is the point of writing a new ordinance if you're going to just include all of the old ordinance conventions? I recommend this entire section be scrapped.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (d) Bus Stop Shelter: This entire section is cumbersome and bureaucratic. According to the Purpose Statement "The regulations encourage...decreased reliance on motor vehicles, and a mixed used development that provides settings for social interaction..." yet the unneeded detail on how, where and why bus stops are to be built, will increase the cost and reduce the likelihood that a bus shelter would be included in a future TOD-A project. This section needs to be less complex and less bureaucratic in order to have the desired affect.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>SECTION (e) Community Garden: Please clarify why the location of a community garden, in relation to a properties lot line is necessary? Also, why should the type, height and style of fencing be codified into the zoning ordinance? These type regulations are unnecessarily punitive to communities wanting gardens. This type of detail in a zoning ordinance will either discourage the use of community gardens or cause people to disregard the ordinance altogether. The value a Community Garden brings should outweigh its need to be regulated so stringently.</p> <p>SECTION (e).4: This provision regulating farm stands seems well intended, but is ultimately misguided. Why should the use of farm stands be codified into the zoning ordinance? This section will negatively impact immigrant communities that frequently use these type farm stands to buy and sell produce. This section needs to be reviewed with the city's International Business Manager's office so as to understand the negative impact this will have on immigrant communities.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (h) Micro-Brewery: sections (h).1 and (h).2 seem to be more unnecessary regulations that would be codified into the zoning ordinance. Why should the size of a restaurant be regulated by zoning? Placing this type of regulation in the zoning ordinance may be asking developers to provide a product that may or may not be conducive to the Charlotte brewery market. Please consider this as you review further.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (i) Mobile Food Vendors: This section troubled me because it could possibly make food truck rallies illegal. This section seems well intended, but it is making an assumption about how businesses work. It seems rational to think that a restaurant would not want direct competition in it's parking lot, but that assumes restaurant and food trucks can't work together, when in fact they can and have done so successfully. See here: <a href="http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/business/small-business/article9114821.html">http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/business/small-business/article9114821.html</a>. Food trucks aren't allowed to sell alcohol in Mecklenburg County, so they should be allowed to partner with breweries and restaurants without this unnecessary ordinance. It should be scrapped, as it would negatively affect the food truck operator economy.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (i).9 &amp; 10 should be scrapped in its entirety. This is an unnecessary regulation of not only food trucks but of a whole section of Charlotte's economy.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (j): Why are the hours of an Open Air Fresh Food Market regulated in the zoning ordinance? This is restrictive for no necessary reason. Also, why should it matter where food is sold in relation to the lot line? Also, how would anyone selling food know where the lot line is or how to measure from it? These sections should be scrapped</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>SECTION (n) Reception Facility: Why is the zoning ordinance regulating who can charge a fee to enter a private facility? Please explain why this needs to be in a zoning ordinance?</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Overall, I am highly disappointed with the Uses sections. Of the 38 pages of draft ordinance we received, 15 pages are Use related. The cover page of the TOD Districts, dated February 22, 2018, states "TOD-A includes a concise list of permitted uses, simple prescribed conditions...as well as a process for implementing innovative projects." Unfortunately, this draft was neither, concise or simple and most likely will not lead to innovative projects. In fact this draft looks more like a text amendment than a zoning ordinance rewrite.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>There is a big difference between the amount of noise generated by outdoor dining and outdoor entertainment (see articles (a), (k), and (n)). The hours and distance separation from residential seem appropriate for outdoor dining but not for outdoor entertainment. Consider increasing the distance separation for outdoor entertainment - it's 250 feet for an Animal Care Facility.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Under Bicycle-Sharing Station 1. and 2., it would seem that even a partial encroachment onto public property would require an encroachment agreement from CDOT.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Not sure if types of fencing are required or prohibited, but article (b) 2. requires a fence. Chain link fence should not be allowed in a TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Under Bicycle-Sharing Station 3.e., a 6-foot pedestrian clearance might not be sufficient in a TOD-A. Could be more than adequate in less intense districts.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Again, I feel very strongly that a Community Garden is not appropriate in a TOD-A as very few people will be able to use the space at any one time making the area off-limits to the vast majority of those using the TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Under Mobile Food Vendors, article 6, consider requiring recycling receptacles in addition to trash receptacles.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Farm stands should be allowed to sell regionally sources produce - at least from other gardens regionally. I can't imagine we're too worries about an explosion of farm stands.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Food truck rules are incredibly lax. The distance of a food truck to unaffiliated restaurant should be greater. Why should a food truck be allowed to camp near a restaurant who pays property tax, etc?</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Structured parking facility active uses at 20'x30' is ok. Should have discretion for small/micro spaces (some - not all).</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Structured parking facility active uses address horizontal width and depth as well as height.... It has to address the store front height, vertical width as well. See this issue on Yadkin Ave near 27th - 8ft opening height at best.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>3. C. Bicycle-Sharing Station needs to address allowances to change permitted tree spaces</p> <p>Overall too prescriptive, ordinance should focus more on bike sharing companies than 'fixed' stations. will be obsolete</p> <p>Should there be provision that IF a managed bike share system is on-site, then it reduces the required amount of bike parking for the development? That's a lot of bike facilities to find space for.</p> <p>3.D.2.B. Bus Stop Shelter Would this not be a City/CATS mandated design? why does the developer need to provide elevations/building materials</p> <p>3.H.1.B Does bar refer to 'tap room', where did these percentages come from? again this isn't promoting adaptive re-use in some size buildings</p> <p>3.H.2. Again, why? Maybe in south end but larger OMB size facilities could be appropriate at other stations to save and re-use old buildings (larger buildings struggle with adaptive re-use depending on size /scale). This promotes tear down.</p> <p>3.H.5. May also need to allow for loading areas for breweries in TOD that are visible, particularly in adaptive re-use... thinking of Sycamore Brewery and how they load their trucks.</p> <p>3.I.10.B Access to available parking for both of these uses is often problematic. Should there be some definition or identification of available public parking within a 3 block radius to accompany submittal?</p> <p>3.L.0% frontage too high - need to exclude stair towers, egress, fire riser/command centers (required to be on front exterior), backflow rooms, exterior transformers and backflow (required to be at setback) - does lobby for parking deck elevator assume 'active' use 14' height too tall, recommend 12' for conversion at later date.</p> <p>Why limit uses? educational, institutional, parking deck lobby, etc. (maybe reference what is NOT considered active use)</p> <p>3.M.2.A This needs a lot more vetting, what is intent? Many times utility companies determine what can be buried vs. overhead, sometimes requiring an overhead pole on your site before underground. Also remove 'transmission/ and insert distribution, wrong nomenclature. Duke has policy it will not go underground for less than 1000'.</p> <p>If you are going to force burial of existing transmission lines along a development frontage, then there needs to be a cost share program in place to help pay for the cost. I agree for a requirement of all NEW transmissions, but often times the burial of existing lines has to continue well beyond the property boundaries</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>for the definition of Animal Care Facility consider a minimum area and/or a % for the covered outdoor area. The % standard will penalize sites that might have a large out door area.</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Prescribed Conditions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I forgot to check, but does "Rapid Transit" include BRT? Maybe OK, but realize the BRT itself has a spectrum of definitions. This should only include the highest standard BRT. Check with CATS for details.</p>	<p>3/8/2018</p>	<p>Definitions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Use definitions go with all other definitions in a comprehensive Definitions section at the end of the whole document. I assume you have put them here for convenience. If you intend them so stay here, PLEASE reconsider. Surely you don't mean to have many different definitions d\sections scattered throughout the document?? That would be truly a recipe for copious misunderstandings and confusion.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Definitions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Medical/Dental office should not include/allow plasma clinics. They are not a medical establishment in that they are not intended to cure illness. They are pawn shops for blood. These are lulu's and should be treated as such. - put this comment in wrong box before</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Definitions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider adding to the definition of Art and Fitness Studios clay studio's. Would a smith shop that creates art in steel products be allowed as a studio? Should the definition of Drive-through facility include retail uses like a drug store or dry cleaners? it should be noted that a proposed change regarding townhomes is the elimination of the sub-lot requirement. Should the definition of a health institution include over-night stay? should the definition of outdoor dining include micro-breweries, wineries, etc.; Should the definition of a Place of Worship also include kitchens and outdoor dining areas?</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Definitions: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No comment</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>This comment applies to the entire Uses and Use Matrix section of TOD-A. Why are we including an outdated, suburban style Use Matrix for the TOD district with the highest intensity and highest density in the entire city? Moreover, why are we explicitly permitting uses in a supposedly urban district which appear to be compatible with urban development anyway? When designing urbanism we have no need to permit urban-style development, but we do need to prohibit specific suburban development and other uses not explicitly urban in nature. In other words, instead of listing 52 urban uses such as offices, medical offices, restaurants, art galleries and bars, we could simply prohibit any use which is not compatible with [this design] and which does not promote [this type of use and environment]. The Use Matrix was lifted almost verbatim from the existing TOD-R in Chapter 9 of the zoning code. If we want to create urbanism we need to have in mind the most urban places that currently exist and plan our places to that idea. Outdated zoning practices such as the Use Matrix (at least in the current form and with the current list) have no place in an urban design code.</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>None</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Relative to facing a parking structure at the street level (item L) I am not sure why we must be able to accommodate restaurants as a use when a number of other appropriate uses are proscribed. Why that one use? That could affect construction pretty dramatically if I was building housing on the street but I had to provide for conversion. Is that what you mean? Are the dimensions proscribed useable for all uses? I would check with a few design professionals.</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>



<p>There is far too much focus on use in what is supposed to be a form-based district. Old-fashioned thinking predominates here. uses are important but secondary to form. Unless staff believe that they are not wholly committed to this rewriting process. They are just tinkering at the edges. Urban history tells us very clearly that urban form and space are much longer lasting g than transitory uses. Be very clear on urban and public space requirements, and consider including building design standards (space and frontage, not aesthetics) that preimate long life and adaptability wherever possible. Because this draft hits you in the face with a huge section on uses, it totally undercuts the intended m message that this is about changing the urban FORM of the city. Form first. Uses second. That's the direction of the flow of history.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Please see my notes below (when we get to Transportation) about deleting my text regarding transportation uses. This form is so clunky that it won't allow me to delete or alter it myself. If my corrective comment gets through to the form you read you will see that the text beginning "OK guys" was part of a critique of another document entirely, from another source. Sorry for the confusion.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The Uses section of this draft of TOD-A was very disappointing. I found it contained way too many words and it over regulated the Uses subtypes. It also appears Planning Staff made several assumptions about how the city's economy works when this was drafted. If Planning Staff has not engaged with the Economic Development office, they should, before creating Uses that are contrary to the goals laid out in the purpose statement and detrimental to economic mobility and economic development.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Please clarify the Discussion Note regarding Adult Uses under section 1.c.3. All of the sentences in the discussion notes say Adult Uses are prohibited, except for the last sentence which states: "Adult uses should be allowed within TOD Districts".</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Also, can you clarify the need for 'principal uses' and 'ancillary uses'? This seems like an unnecessary division of uses in this ordinance. In addition, section 1.d seems vague. This verbiage opens itself up to all kinds of interpretations to uses and projects that will be antithetical to the TOD-A designation.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Uses Community Garden a. All areas in cultivation must be set back a minimum of five feet from a lot line. b. Any accessory structures used must be set back a minimum of ten feet from a lot line. Accessory structures are limited to 15 feet in height. Accessory structures are limited to 120 square feet in area, with the exception of greenhouses and farmstands that are limited to 300 square feet in area. - 5 Feet, 15 Feet. 120 square feet, 300 square feet à€“ What is the justification for these numbers. Did Staff come up with them? Were they left over from older ordinance? Micro-Brewery/Distillery/Winery 1. The establishment must include a restaurant and/or within the same building. The restaurant and/or bar must meet the following conditions: a. The standards of Section ____.(3)(a) above must be met. b. The minimum size of the restaurant and/or bar must be 20% of the total square footage for the establishment and the restaurant and/or bar or 1,500 square feet, whichever is less. - Why does a Brewery have to have a restaurant? Why must it be this size? Public Utility Structures - Was DUKE consulted in these regulations?</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Medical/Dental office should not include/allow plasma clinics. These are lulu's and should be treated as such.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Just a few thoughts.... Public Utility Structures &amp; Public Utility Transmission and Distribution Lines: i hope the effort to revise this ordinance and the UDO in general can include an attempt to locate all utility structures underground or inside structures....period!</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>This would include changing Charlotte Water back flow preventer locations, CATS and Duke Energy transmission boxes.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>1 TOD-Uses 1. A. Existing uses to remain? this could be to rezone for future development, or possible existing uses remain in phased project</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Use - Regulations: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>You write: It is recognized that there are certain uses which, because of their unique characteristics, cannot be properly classified in a particular district or districts without consideration of the impact of those uses upon neighboring land and of the public need for the particular use at the particular location.  What on earth would these be in your densest, more pedestrian focused TOD-A district? Should this even be here?</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Special Use Permits: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I don't understand the objection to having special use permits. They are rare - ie special use. These can be conspired case by case with some back up standards to keep things predicable.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Special Use Permits: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>This doesn't belong here but i'm going to add that this is the time to float the idea of a Design Review Board comprised of design professionals. it will be VERY controversial but if we don't try to establish this now...it will never happen. This is a great start!</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Special Use Permits: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>not sure Special use permits are needed. Cannot evaluate completely until uses that would be allowed are listed. The standards for approval are very general and may create difficulty determining when something should be approved or denied.</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Special Use Permits: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>24 ft is too little for a TOD-A. I notice that if the ground floor is for residential, the floor spacing is 12 ft. So you would permit a 2-story residential unit 1/4 mi from a transit station. That's nuts! How about the minimum being 17 = 3 x 12 or 53 ft. Every building should be able to accommodate ground-floor retail.</p>	<p>3/8/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No single-story buildings! No residential space separated from nearby buildings by parking! Force residential and office space above retail! Require truly mixed-use buildings! This is how you build an area where people will want to walk and will walk!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Minimum building height requirements should gradually decrease moving from higher density/intensity areas to lower. Higher density/intensity areas should have a higher minimum (e.g. 6 stories) and lower density/intensity areas should not allow fewer than 2 stories.</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>remove the bulls-eye plans. height should not be restricted because a SF use or zoning exists 2 blocks away. these are linear zoning districts that thread through many other zoning districts. Considering SF districts will limit development heights without significantly affecting the SF use/zoning. Further, even if SF is adjacent to the parcel, there should be a provision that states that if the lot has direct frontage on the cats line, no height restrictions should be in place. essentially, we want density along the line. If there is a SF house there already, the greater good needs to be considered. We want the CATS line to be dense and tall, like a nutrient rich vein running through the city. SF houses in the wrong place should not be an impediment to that growth.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>sorry, i keep getting these in the wrong place. minimum should be 2 story with a very good reason.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>OK</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The minimum height of the TOD-A need to be increased. The point of having "highly intensive" development should require a higher barrier to entry. Five stories seems to be an appropriate height for this type of district.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>24 feet or two stories might be too low. A case in point is the area around the East-West Station on the Blue line. There is not nearly enough activity immediately adjacent to the station because the buildings are too small.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Table 2-Minimum Building Height Why is 2 story rqmt needed? doesn't promote re-use of existing buildings</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Minimum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The maximum should also be raised to somewhere between 85 and 100 ft. It's about station-area density.</p>	<p>3/11/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No max heights! Let buildings go as tall as they want! More density means more people walking in the area, bringing the streets alive and using public transit and supporting the local stores and businesses!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Maximum building height requirements should gradually decrease as development progresses out from the highest density/intensity areas but there should be no maximum in that highest density/intensity area, only in subsequent TOD areas</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>65' is almost a suburban standard these days, with the higher rooflines often required by planners and desired by architects, at least for housing. I think it is a non-starter for in city dense product but you should ask the design folks. I realize that we want to provide height opportunities as an incentive and support that idea, I just think that we should target the max at something that we would like to see the most of, i.e. make it easy to do. Personally, I suggest something like the 5 story product that DC allows; very dense, very attractive feel. Maybe 65' is enough for that but I would check.</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>remove the bulls-eye plans. height should not be restricted because a SF use or zoning exists 2 blocks away. these are linear zoning districts that thread through many other zoning districts. Considering SF districts will limit development heights without significantly affecting the SF use/zoning. Further, even if SF is adjacent to the parcel, there should be a provision that states that if the lot has direct frontage on the cats line, no height restrictions should be in place. essentially, we want density along the line. If there is a SF house there already, the greater good needs to be considered. We want the CATS line to be dense and tall, like a nutrient rich vein running through the city. SF houses in the wrong place should not be an impediment to that growth</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

Maximum Base Building Height – How was this determined? Based on Building code? This needs to be furthered discussed and explored. I am not sure that these numbers are the right starting numbers. Is the reason for a maximum so we can have a Bonus?	3/21/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.
65' is too high to get any one to seek incentives. Short of maximum wood frame construction height is ideal	3/22/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Note that building heights above 75' are classified as High Rise Special Construction in the International Building Code and require considerable additional costs.	2/28/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Charlotte is not a market that is density constrained, it is constrained by the cost of construction and construction type. Height bonuses will not entice development to move to larger buildings because the increase in construction price will not be offset by rents/income.	3/12/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
This sections should provide a bonus when the building height is AT LEAST 250 feet, should not call this a building height maximum	3/12/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Made my bonus comments above. For market rate product, at least back it off to 80% of less and 10% of the units. You might then get some. If you get a whole bunch we can always change but when has that happened in CLT thus far? I'd LIKE to have that problem.	3/13/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
i dont think the bonus is needed if we solve the SF problem. But i like the idea - provide greater public good, and you get a taller building.	3/19/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Not sure this is worth the battle. We haven't got to worry about exceeding 250' in TOD (in most places) for another decade. Could make >250' a Planned Development district. Would be conditional anyway in most cases, even after we do less conditionals.	3/22/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Step backs are very good!!!	3/22/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please
Why are we offering bonuses for basic urban design elements instead of requiring it? Developers of course prefer incentives over mandates but that's allowing them to decide whether or not to implement our vision for these areas. These rules need to ensure our vision (as defined by the place types) is implemented; not leave it up to the developer to decide if they want to honor the vision. If this is what we do, what's the point of having a vision (place types)?	3/23/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Table 2-Max Building Height with Bonus - very few r/w over 100'. Where does step back occur/ which story? Is intent for better ground level / pedestrian experience or sky line views? Height trigger way too low, why not match base height (recommend 85')? also needs to consider exempting a min. parcel size where this might not be practical Base height in TOD should accommodate 6 story building/ 5 over podium. (85') Certainly TOD-A. There is no reason to go thru those gymnastics for a typical construction type.	3/23/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Height WITH BONUS: Please share any questions/comments you have.
this was the restriction on the original skyscrapers so that the buildings did not impose or seem to tall to people on the street. i have walked beside those buildings, and i do not think it was necessary or desirable. let a building be tall right up to the edge. it is more dramatic, better use of land, creates more density, and you don't gain anything really by stepping back.	3/19/2018	Dimensional Standards - Required Height Stepback: Please share any questions/comments you have.
OK	3/20/2018	Dimensional Standards - Required Height Stepback: Please share any
Step backs are very good!	3/22/2018	Dimensional Standards - Required Height Stepback: Please share any
Require small footprints! Mix buildings together, close together, to create attractive walking environments! No one wants to walk along a single bland wall! Limit all buildings regardless of height or use to a square no more than 200 feet on each side!	3/12/2018	Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>30' separation is too great. In some circumstances (severe grade issues) multiple buildings may need to occur. forcing them wider apart than fire regulations is a misuse of land and would unduly expand sites. if minimums there must be, use 15'. but i would question what is to be gained by putting this in the zoning ordinance. what is the benefit to the built form? better to let this kind of an issue defer to building code and avoid cluttering development up with another restriction that is already covered elsewhere.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>again, i dont think an existing sub-use of property (residential district) should supersede the goals of a dense transit corridor and hence the max building footprint adjacent to a residential district should apply.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Never use text alone where diagrams make things easier to understand.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Maximum Building Footprint "When abutting residential district" TOD-A cannot abut a residential district " See TOD-A may not be applied when fronting or abutting a single family residential district."</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Table 2-Max Building Footprint Obviously, there need to be exemptions for adaptive re-use of buildings for footprint and length  Why do we need to specify max building length? Particularly if the ordinance sets max block length? Also, many good instances of where length is broken up with courtyards to mitigate length. (i.e.: The Lexington/Dilworth MF )  Examples of projects such as Camden Gallery could not be built  How is this calculated? Per block face? Most city blocks 400'.....this also conflicts with min. frontage rqmts later in design section. 250' building length doesn't allow for a parking deck wrapped with uses (residential, office, etc.).  Recommend removing this section and leaving Design Standard 4 to deal with modulations</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider less than 30 feet as the separation standard.</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Footprint: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Is 250' maximum building length measured to break in building or overall building length? Charlotte city blocks are 400'-450' long, so overall building length max at 250' would be roughly a half block.</p>	<p>2/28/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Require all buildings, regardless of height or use, to a square no bigger than 200 feet on each side! The World Trade Center towers were limited to this footprint! Create an attractive walking environment by mixing uses and textures along the streets! This is how you encourage walking!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Buildings should not fill the entire block face, or, if the building does fill the entire block face, efforts should be made to break up the architecture for aesthetic and functional purposes to give the appearance of multiple structures along the block face</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>allow such things as colonnades, archways, etc to be used to break up a buildings mass. Europe has many examples of large blocks of buildings seeming small and humane by use of these type features.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>we all know the project that emphasizes why long buildings can be an issue. i dont think that particular building would have been much more aesthetic solely by restricting the length. Other factors, such as drive connections, significant change in material, and substantial fenestration might have better solved the issue. So instead of saying the building has to be broken into two, perhaps it had a minimum 15' wide recess a minimum of 8' deep, with materials substantially different than the rest of the building in color, scale, and texture. That does the same thing, but allows the developer to keep his halls connected and avoid adding an additional elevator, driving up development costs. This could also include sky bridges as an alternate allowance. I recently did a very long building broken in the middle by a sky bridge. It appears like two buildings, and for all intents and purposes is, but we were able to avoid an extra \$110k for an additional elevator. We need to look at these problems carefully. not just, dont do this, but more, if you do this, you must do this instead. that gives greater flexibility to the development world and still attains the desired ends. to that end, saying, this is the maximum period is not a good approach.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Never use text alone where diagrams make things easier to understand.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Maximum Building Length: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Say NO to wasted land! Keep buildings close to each other! Say NO to surface parking lots! Say NO to moving buildings back from the streets! Keep buildings close together and against the sidewalk! This is how you encourage people to walk and keep the streets active and interesting! If buildings do need private yards, put them in the back!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Primary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>i am fine with this. however, clarify what a structure is defined as. i can see scenarios where i want to face my development on the rail, so my garage goes on the street. is that a structure? if it is, then what are the rules for that type of structure? retail ground floor? public art above? for that matter, do we need a build to percentage on the transit side as well? there are plenty of examples where developers decided a parking lot was the best treatment of the rail side edge....</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Primary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Guess what? Never use text alone where diagrams make things easier to understand.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Primary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Table 2-Primary Street Build-To Percentage<del>s</del> open space excluded (Railyard for example). Existing buildings such as design center? Open space should count towards primary street build to percentage</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Primary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>And again. Never use text alone where diagrams make things easier to understand.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Secondary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>60% might be low in a TOD-A. Even the secondary streets in these areas should have a lot of pedestrians. The standards should encourage pedestrian activity to the greatest extent possible.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Secondary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Secondary build to's should easily achieved. We're asking for great primary streets, this can be more flexible.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - Secondary Build-To Percentage: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Creation and implementation of a public art strategy for the site (2 points) OK as long as some arts commission does not pontificate or have to OK a art piece on exterior of building. Calculations should include art on exterior as well as the common interior spaces. (DD)</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>clarify about interior spaces and grade. if a plaza or monumental stairway is used as an intermediary between interior and exterior. this may be a better way go get strong relationships on sloped sites.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>I am genuinely shocked by this section. Almost everything you note here as eligible for bonuses comprise requirements of good, basic urban design. These should be MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, not add-on extras for bonuses!  Basic good urban design will get me 23 points here without breaking sweat. Why do I get bonuses merely for doing my job as a competent professional?  If we think architects and developers can't meet these basic standards without "bonuses" , then these design elements must be REQUIRED. They must be non-negotiable and the code must quash urban design mistakes at the outset.</p> <p>And what does my easy 23 points bonus get me?</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Having a Fee-in-lieu of urban fabric seems like an unnecessary loophole for exploitation. This section need to be constructed with care to avoid payments in lieu of good design. This ordinance also need to make including these features easier, don't over regulate it.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The inclusion of 20% of accessible public parking is a loophole that will incentivize more parking decks. We need to encourage less, not more parking. This section should be scrapped.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I would be very opposed to allowing a fee-in-lieu of the creation of public spaces above requirements in order to obtain a height bonus. Build the public spaces in a TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Public art is great, even necessary. However, the devil is in the details. A small red exclamation point - like that on the Rail Trail, should not be worth the same as additional public space.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider making all bonuses on a sliding scale instead of a binary 0 or two.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>"Arcades, galleries, colonnades and similar pedestrian oriented ground floor designs" (see Table 4, Item 8) should get a bonus.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Urban Fabric â€œ This is subjective, how do you codify Design Character? Would this just not create a recipe for a same-same?</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>These are great ideas, but we have a long way to go with the points awarded and specific metrics. May need to consider simply - pick 2 from the menu to exceed base height (lower than 65') by any number to max height. Just see this getting sloppy and returning to a situation where we negotiate everything.... and bonuses.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>If we suggest fee in lieu, let's work that out now. It never seems to have a good mechanism for redistributing \$\$.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The devil is in the points scale.... I see lots of difficulty in achieving a balance here. We will need to consider the value of brain damage / time spent in negotiating these into the ordinance. Not that they should be abandoned, but very very very simple.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We should be requiring basic design standards rather than simply incentivizing them. Developers will likely not voluntarily pursue these bonus actions if they don't desire taller buildings.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric:  Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Table 3 Urban Fabric</p> <p>More detail on size requirements, how does this overlap with urban open space rqmts.</p> <p>Need to exclude stairs/egress, backflow/fire riser rooms (rqd to be on street frontage), exterior backflow and transformers</p> <p>Recommend definition of 'meet grade' is within 24" of sidewalk grade. Need flexibility on sloping streets for tenant/larger spaces to be subdivided. Metropolitan at zoe's is good example.</p> <p>Points too low, % too high. Is there a max. Parking that caps? would sharing be considered where office projects open after hours, or vice versa with residential</p> <p>Development should be able to submit a shared parking logic that highlights a number of FLEX spaces that are publicly accessible, not just a fixed number</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>the standard for active ground-floor space to occupy 100% of the building length may be difficult, other uses may need space on the ground floor.</p>	<p>3/24/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Urban Fabric: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I've seen some stupid special interest issues put into our codes in the past especially regarding wheelchair handicapped accessible units but this one is useless garbage. Anyone living at one of these urban apartments will have their own shower in their unit so the provision of a shower and locker room facilities is not needed and way over the top.</p> <p>Even applying this to proposed provision to office or retail facilities should be the province of the building owner or the tenant / employer. If enough bikers request these type facilities they will be installed because of market forces and demand not because two people are upset that they cannot take a shower when they get to work. Using the bike to ride to an office is their person choice, not the employer of building owner. Yea if they want to give a bonus for this they might want to add more points because it's expensive to install for something that will not get used much. (DD)</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>See my previous response above.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The provisions for showers and lockers for bikers should be included for all TOD-A facilities instead of being part of a bonus menu. If we as a city want to encourage "...decreased dependent on motor vehicles.." we must include provisions for other transportation choices.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The 50% minimum is contradictory, if this is for TOD-A, which should be highly urbanized, then why allow surface parking? I recommend providing 50% of the development area square footage be covered with solar panels (ex. 25,000 sf building footprint needs 12,500 sf of solar panels on the roof or property.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider bonuses for LEED certified (or equivalent) buildings.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Ground-level surface parking should be discouraged in a TOD-A and should not get any bonus whether it has solar panels or not.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Why make adding a shower facility to a building harder by requiring bike parking? Let's not make the good impossible to in hopes to get the great!</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Anything that includes use of solar panels over a percentage of area should have the % cut in half. Otherwise it will not happen for a very very very long time.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We strongly support offering a bonus for renewable energy. Need more time to determine what these should be.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>



<p>Energy and Environment seems incredibly difficult to administer. Developments usually are over a year into design before they've fully understand mechanical, electrical, LEED systems. Well beyond when they need certainty of height. Do you have internal staff to review this? make MUCH simpler</p> <p>Regional systems that connect multiple parcels are not allowed in zoning ordinance (considered accessory use). also private drainage in public r/w typically not allowed in encroachment scenarios</p> <p>What level of grey water qualifies?</p> <p>Does this promote surface parking? 50% way too high - aesthetic at ground level??</p> <p>Expand from not sure solar but add tree canopy (help reduce heat island and visual aesthetic from higher bldgs.).</p> <p>Or fabric shade structure? Is objective to reduce Heat Island Effect? Or promote solar? specifying solar is too prescriptive</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Energy and Environment: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>If they want developers to save the facades of some of these older building but they must be in a similar vernacular as the new portion of the new building they want to put on the site..</p> <p>Land at these TOD sites has become so expensive that the existing building even if in good enough shape to get renovated as a alternate to the current industrial use needs to adequately fit in the buildable area. The existing building facade must also be in the appropriate location and in good enough shape, on the site to maximize the buildable (very expensive) site area. Given the high cost to preserve these facades seems to me that the bonus points is way too low to entice a developer to save it. If they are serious about saving older buildings and or facades they must significantly up the bonus points to a level as high or higher than the affordable housing bonus points stated in their draft ( which is by the way not high enough to entice a developer too put in even 10% much less the too high 15% suggested</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>See my previous response above.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The structured parking section needs to be removed. The current point structure incentivizes practices the city doesn't want. Would also recommend increasing the points for the "Design of New Structures" from 1 to 4.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Building Reuse " why 50 years? Why not 10? Is the point to save only old buildings or to save and reuse buildings?</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>add "materials" to design of new structures compatible with...</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>reuse of old facades never really look good. Such a Charlotte thing to do - the soul of a building is not in the facade. This tends to get added to make neighborhoods happy. no incentive necessary.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Building Reuse remainder of ordinance needs to better reflect building reuse</p> <p>Urban storage</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>All of these actions are worth incentivizing. The action related to the design of structured parking to facilitate reuse is especially important given the rise of autonomous vehicles and car sharing. Why not require this instead of incentivizing?</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Building Reuse: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Every building in a TOD-A should be REQUIRED to provide bike racks or storage and showers for employees. A bonus would not be needed. No bonus for parking, they can build what they will operate by charging market rates for parking. The only bonus might be for two or more properties arranging for shared parking, such as an office building and a theater. You don't need bonus points for solar shading of surface parking because there should be NO surface parking in a TOD_A. In fact any parking should be located out at the fringe.</p> <p>In place of dropping some of the noted bonuses, suggest offering bonus points for development of an effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. This would require ongoing oversight to assure results. Goals, such as a percent reduction of SOV trips below a baseline with regular reporting and penalties for falling short.</p>	<p>3/8/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Transportation Improvements + Right-of-Way Dedication: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Again, don't incentivize things that must be minimum requirements.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Transportation Improvements + Right-of-Way Dedication: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We strongly support offering a bonus for transportation improvements and right-of-way dedication. Need more time to determine what these should be.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Transportation Improvements + Right-of-Way Dedication: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Why is this listed 5th of the 5 options? This makes this option appear deemphasized. Also, regarding the scoring, if affordable housing is a priority why are the scores provided not larger multiples of the other Bonus Actions? At 4 points, having 10% affordable units at 80% AMI is worth the same to the city as the additional features added to a parking deck (in the Building Reuse section)?</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The height bonus is only helpful if the project can remain in the same building type when it receives the bonus (wood frame, wrap, etc.). Otherwise, the deals will not underwrite as crossing over into a denser building type may increase your costs 15-20%.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I do not think any market-rate developer, regardless of bonus, can make an &lt;80% AMI deal underwrite at today's construction prices. The spread between market rate rents and 60% AMI is too great. So, this whole bonus structure self-selects the dedicated affordable housing community to participate here, which is great although potentially more difficult if there is a rezoning process.</p> <p>Also, this dedicated affordable developer community is a fraction of the size of the market rate developer world, so there needs to be an option to attract market-rate developers as well. I would argue that getting 10%, 15%, 20% units at 80% AMI is a huge win for the city. These tenants are competing for housing with the 60% AMI renters anyway.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>There should be a unit mix option here as well. From an affordable standpoint, one of the issues with the recent in-town (say, Southend) apartment projects is that they are almost all 1 &amp; 2 bedrooms, with limited, if any, 3 bedrooms. What if you had a height bonus for any project that had at least 10% 3 bedrooms, which is the standard for suburban deals although this is creeping up given how difficult it is for single-family developers to build the affordable for-sale product. Let's say there are 5 300-unit deals built in the TOD-A district that dedicate 10% 3BR units. That's 150 3BR units that are in service now that are more attainable to affordable renters, and easier to qualify for from a % of AMI perspective based on the household size. Over time, the units become affordable and you have locked in options for families in these districts.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Is Building Height the right carrot? What about reduced parking requirements or fast-track rezoning or permitting? Or a combination of all of these?</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Let's say a project qualifies for and receives a height bonus for dedicating 10% affordable units. Who administers the ongoing compliance of this? Is there a document available so that the developer can understand what he or she is agreeing to for this? Is this commitment indefinite or say 20 years? If the developer sells the project, assume this commitment will be in the deeds? These are important questions that need to be answered and there needs to be an off-the-shelf toolkit explaining this both for the developer but also for the capital sources. The lender and equity provider will want to be really clear on what the developer's obligations are in this scenario for the initial developer and subsequent owners. If this is not available, and a developer is forced to figure this out as the project plays out, it will be a headwind for adoption. Other deals are easier to do.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>clue as to the costs and associated returns involved in a urban apartment or residential deal. I'm only going to address the affordability as it relates to apartment rentals.</p> <p>First issue is a developer in a urban deal couldn't get enough bonus density to offset the negative costs involved in his offering 15% of his units at 60% of median income. We've played around with the numbers in a market rate apartment rental deal with differing percentages of affordable units. The profoma I ran with any affordable units in excess of 10% of the units at 60% of median income, without any city cost reductions or mortgage subsidies did not yield enough to create a marketable deal in today's market. I did run some numbers with 10% at 60% and 10% at 80% and utilized some reduced city fees as well as low interest second mortgage from city and the returns appeared to be equal to an all market rate deal. The bonus points without anything else from the city do not help returns when using affordable units!</p> <p>The amounts of reduced city fees and or costs and second mortgages are different on every deal depending on location, construction costs/methods, format and size. Think if they want any participation in this category they will have to reduce number to 10% at 60% and 10% at 80% and also offer some reduced costs like permit fees, zoning fees, inspection fees, SMUD fees and ect. to get the cash flow returns with subsidies equal to what the developer would have received with 100% at market rents. The bonus points for this one are not as important to a developer as the reduced fees and costs from the city. Matter of fact, once the developer exceeds three stories of wood framed structure his costs increase significantly due to code requirements and life safety issues required on larger and higher building. Four story wood structured building increase costs a min. of 15 to 20% per unit not including parking. Going to five stories wood frame increase prices an additional approx.. 25% per unit. Then the granddaddy of them all is when you exceed a height of 75 feet in height you need to go with a high rise code which almost doubles the cost of a unit from that of a three story wood building, again not including parking on site.</p> <p>Parking on site in a TOD urban deal will almost certainly involve either detached or wrapped parking deck which if built with precast concrete panels and beams will cost approx.. \$17,000 to \$20,000 per parking space. A deck that will have a building built on top of it will be made in solid concrete, poured in place, and will cost significantly more per parking space, somewhere in the \$22,000 and up per space range. With a parking ratio of 1.5 parking spaces per unit your parking costs of \$24,000 to \$33,000 per unit is added on top of the increased prices for dense urban product.</p> <p>Do not think there is any realistic density bonus that make a lot of difference for the developer. As his density goes up along with his per unit costs the amount of his subsidy between the affordable rates and market rents become exponentially larger, leading to substantially reduced returns on investments. (DD)</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We know incentives have a weak track record for affordable housing. This is truly the hardest nut to crack given that the development community is pretty solidly against building affordable housing, although they hide this opposition behind weasel words. I think the city has got to spend money and land bank sites on which they can set their own terms.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Affordable housing is a major issue in the city. However, it seems that the bonuses here are out of proportion to the other bonuses. It might make a developer decide to forgo any other bonuses.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Affordable Housing  -100% ami probably can not be done without a subsidy. So the bonuses are increasing costs for the construction process while also reducing income then the projects will have a hard time being feasible.  -The AMI Affordable Bonus needs to be equal to the full height bonus.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Why require 50% of GFA devoted to residential? Don's want affordable if it's 40% of mixed use building? Drop this requirement - it makes a good thing harder to achieve than it already is.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We think it's extremely important to provide incentives for affordable housing. Need more time to determine what these should be. Why are no bonuses offered for units at or below 30% AMI?</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Affordable Housing Overall section needs much more vetting on AMI %, unit %, and bonus points. Has this been discussed with multiple developers that it would actually incentivize height? The cost in this might be at a point where this solely qualifies for height bonus.</p> <p>Add payment in lieu option for affordable</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - Affordable Housing: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Draft bonus reward is no different than current, underutilized density bonus; this encourages mixed use, but quickly gets into more expensive High Rise Special Construction per the IBC (buildings higher than 75'). MUST create additional bonuses such as expedited planning and permitting review, planning or permitting fee waiver, qualifications for lending or grants from Community Trust Fund, otherwise no one will use it.</p>	<p>2/28/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>We have a housing affordability crisis and housing cars is huge cost component of urban housing. Why would have a 65' height limit anywhere close to transit. Just completely counter intuitive. If we want to reduce congestion and improve the success of our transit system, I would think we would have a 65' height minimum, not maximum.</p> <p>My favorite quote these days: Clarity dissolves Resistance. If the things are desired in the height bonus just require them. Make it crystal clear so that everyone knows the rules and then you will have more participants.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>In my experience a height bonus once you get above five stories has no value. It will be important for groups that build high-rise deals to weigh in. The cost of construction once you get above five stories only works in a few submarkets in Charlotte. For what it's worth I think automatic zoning (40b) for affordable housing has worked well in Massachusetts. "Massachusetts Comprehensive Permit Act: Chapter 40B. The Comprehensive Permit Act is a Massachusetts law which allows developers of affordable housing to override certain aspects of municipal zoning bylaws and other requirements."</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>For developments that qualify for the bonus, would the project still require going through the rezoning process? Or if the projects meet a certain scoring?</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>, Offer building height bonus points for EV charging stations. (if I make a comment for a topic, it remains there when I re-open the site, and I cannot add to, or edit it.)</p>	<p>3/11/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I am not wild about fees in lieu for planning items like paseos, etc. That relief is necessary as we get into very high buildings. The rest of the items sound nice but I would sure like to know if these trade offs and standards have been used successfully in other cities of similar size and development pace. Could we have some real work examples?</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>See my comments at the top of this section. Why are we so timid that we feel we have to incentivize basic urban design standards etc, instead of requiring them? Developers will push back at anything, weak or strong, so never start out weak! I really do think this approach is weak and timid. This is not a text amendment. It is a component of A NEW VISION&gt;</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>Please provide clarification on the following questions: What is the point structure for this section, who in the city will administer this, how will it be enforced? Will this point structure be updated periodically? If so, how? By Text Amendment?</p> <p>I would also like to see points for: 1) providing residents of residential units or workers with transit passes in lieu of parking spaces. Or reduce/eliminate the amount of parking required. 2) Including bike share, transit stop or covered shelter for commuters for reductions in parking and/or allow these facilities to be built within the setbacks.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Sliding scales might be more appropriate for all bonuses instead of requiring that a threshold be met in order to get the entire bonus. (i.e., maybe provide 1 bonus point if a parking structure can provide 30% coverage for solar panels and 2 points if 50% is reached.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Instead of Height what other bonuses could be used?</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Need so many more options to make this work. Also - I feel certain that metrics will be tied to the one's already listed to avoid negotiating these. Finally - bonuses are a good concept. Would love to see it stay, but it will be hard to get consensus around this. If it can make it in the ordinance in any way - it is a total win.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Dimensional Standards 2.B.i. Bonus Actions Bonus level needs more levels, recommend 65 base, 90, 120, 150, 200, 250</p> <p>Dimensional Standards 3. 2.C. OVERALL COMMENT; POINT STRUCTURE NEEDS TO RELATE MORE TO COST / DENSITY AS DEVELOPERS WILL LOOK AT COST BENEFIT. NO ALIGNMENT OF COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS</p> <p>ALSO VERY RARE PROJECTS WILL GO 250', NEED MORE FLEXIBILITY FROM 65' - 150'</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Building Height Bonus - General Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>What incentives or bonuses are other cities using? What is the national best practice?</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Comments on Bonus Actions (listed above): Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>17' - would like an understanding of how this number was calculated. that is a very expensive ask.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>12' - also a very expensive ask</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>also thinking, this is measured from FFE to FFE. At the ground level, FFE relationships are kind of moot. More important is FFE to average grade plane. BLDG Stds uses 6' out from the building for their calculations. I think a similar approach should be used, FFE at the ground level varies greatly from side to side, so if you want tall ground level, say a minimum of 11' with an average grade plane of 12' 5' out from the building.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>item 7 - allowing buildings to use a variety of materials promotes the break down of the building. so saying generally that they all must match and wrap is probably not the best. also, it appears to compete with the next sentence that says if materials change, 3" separation.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>item 8 - i like this as a way to go around the maximum building length mentioned earlier. i would note that this breezeway must be open (not gated) at the entry.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>DIAGRAMS DIAGRAMS DIAGRAMS please. Come on folks. It's not that hard. If I can do this form-based code stuff and be pretty good at it, then it can't be that hard. Really.</p> <p>I guess there is an aversion here towards anything to do with the Smart Code. Don't understand this prejudice. You don't have to like DPZ to benefit from their work. In practice we can generally customize the diagrams in the Smart Code to suit our requirements. This section is so much more confusing than it should be. In fact I think - sorry to say this -- I think it has to be completely rethought in format and graphic presentation. The facade drawings are well intentioned but too detailed., There is a lot of repetition in the text. Which is the primary source for reference? Tables or diagrams?</p> <p>The facade drawings are too detailed and not diagrammatic enough. And dare I say it, the facades are not very good. They don't really help. Much more diagrammatic plan, section and elevation diagrams would convey what you want to say much more effectively. And PLEASE, don't ask the reader to turn the folder 90 degrees to read and study and then turn it back again 90 degrees the other way to check something on a previous page. Aaarrrggghhhhh!</p> <p>Seriously. That's a big problem in using and comprehending the format that governs what you are trying to say. Design Graphics 101.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I didn't understand Table 4 or how it works with the new TOD-A district.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I do not think that there is a huge cost difference for decorative elements spaced 20 feet or 50 feet apart. Consider combining items 3 and 4 to require decorative elements every 20 feet, even for limited access road/parkway. (I believe the second sentence of both items should read "Wall lengths..." not "Wall areas...")</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider including a height bonus for providing pedestrian oriented ground floor designs - Item 8.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>There is no section on Design Standards (1) and (2) (1) Substantial Addition -Why not increase this number to 35% and eliminate the 1,000? Don't we want to encourage reuse and create personality not force everyone into the standardize boring rules? Doesn't creative reuse spur new development? (2) Substantial Alteration -Why discourage the investing into the life and look of a building? What does incidental mean? Doesn't this just encourage old building to stay old looking and discourage adaptive reuse? It also reinforces the idea that it is easier to not something down then reuse it.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Facade Articulation &amp; Massing -3 Why 20 feet? -5 This seems very formulaic it may eliminate bad design but it wont allow cool design either.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Substantial addition threshold of 1,000 seems too low for substantial alteration, especially for larger buildings that have potential for adaptive reuse.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>per #8 - I do not think the ordinance made for conventional zoning districts should "encourage" anything. Make it will/shall or drop it and add it to the area plan.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Per #6 - Developers have now figured out that they can just do "vertical bays." Either add more options or delete this option. Having only one suggestion makes them all do this one thing.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>#13 - This seems unclear or maybe a solve to a specific issue that I am not sure we have? Could be wrong. It just stands out as being very specific.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>#15 - this is great. but all units are now b/w 2-3'</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>General Comment: i really like the illustration that summarizes the standards. i know this is probably too much but i wish each of the points in Table 4 could include illustrations of each point as well. In other words...i think we need both....illustrations in the table as well as the summary illustrations with explanations below as you have prepared.</p> <p>Thank you!!!! for 17 feet ground floor standard.</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>GENERAL Design Standards 2.A.2.A. The parameters need to be defined. X % of each building face. And the statement of 'would prolong life of the supporting members of the building' is ambiguous.</p> <p>Design Standards 2.A.2.B. How would you track this?</p> <p>Design Standards 2.A.3. The parameters need to be defined. X % of each building face. And the statement of 'would prolong life of the supporting members of the building' is ambiguous.</p> <p>Table 4.1. 7' TOO HIGH FOR 'BASE', ON SITES WITH SLOPE - MANY TIME INITIAL GROUND FLOOR COULD START AT 14' AND BE 20+ ON OPPOSITE END OF BLOCK WITH STEPPED SLABS TO RELATE TO STREET GRADE. NOT ALL USES NEED 17' BASE HEIGHT - Consider average height with a min. base height of 14'</p> <p>If residential use won't be converted, what is 12' requirement for? Significant increase in cost for housing - suggest removing.</p> <p>Table 4.5. Why isn't this sufficient in lieu of 250' building length maximum?</p> <p>Further define what qualifies for modulation (PED overlay has definition)</p> <p>Table 4.6 &amp; 7. Policing concern of qualified reviewers on what classifies as appropriate architectural design - do we have staff that is trained with this?</p> <p>Table 4.8. If arcades are to be encouraged, there needs to be some definition as to how the arcade works with the sidewalk and streetscape.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Most form-based codes include diagrams to illustrate design standards in addition to tables of text, so they are easier to read and understand. Would like to see the addition of diagrams in this section. Very supportive of higher design standards. This is extremely important and desperately needed.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Articulation &amp; Massting: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Keep the building entrance on the sidewalk! Do not allow back entrances that everyone will use instead of activating the street! Do not push buildings back from the sidewalk! People will walk streets when the buildings are one the sidewalk and not separated by surface parking lots or dead space!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>item 11- keep it at 75 spacing. A 200' building could end load all the sidewalks on one side, ie, where the club is.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>item 13 - realize this means accessible ramps. not that it is a bad thing, but this could lead to a bunch of ramps along the frontage.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>item 15 - a personal pet peeve. this is a non-buildable request. i get the 24" minimum, though i would say 18" is more viable. 36" max is just not a good idea. personally, i like the idea of requiring all units facing the street to have direct access. these dont need to be accessible, they add value to the streetscape and the unit, and it is the kind of thing that is good for the city and community, and a thing a developer will likely not do unless required. but if 36" is the max, you will make it so a lot less units have direct access. Many sites fall much more than 3' across a frontage, so you are essentially saying that the bulk of the units dont have to have direct access on those sites. i get it though, you dont want huge flights of stairs. there are plenty of bad examples. But there are lots of good examples out there too. so lets see what makes the good examples work and tailor the code that way instead of arbitrarily restricting these to 36". Such things as shared direct entries work really well in some locations.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p> <p>3/19/2018</p>
<p>Sidewalk entrances must be kept unlocked during working hours. No fire exit doors to count.</p> <p>#12 We all know nice older apartment buildings with pleasant entries off a slightly setback courtyard, or a fine central portico. There are very few good modern equivalents of these typologies, and in principle it is better to enliven the street with individual entrances and stoops. This provides markers of habitation and scale.</p> <p>A single entrance should only be permitted under special conditions as an exception.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p> <p>3/20/2018</p>
<p>In Item 13, consider requiring a connection to the sidewalk for outdoor space within 5 feet of finished grade as these spaces are still visually connected to the sidewalk.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p> <p>3/21/2018</p>
<p>Building Entry</p> <p>-#9 Why this list? What if something is not on this list? By having a list you don't allow new ideas people will just follow the list and pick the simplest.</p> <p>-#10 Why 75?</p> <p>-#13 " this s a Bad Idea.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p> <p>3/21/2018</p>
<p>Table 4.10. Some uses don't want to promote a variety of access points if not ground floor retail or residential (security, etc.). don't want to promote 'locked' doors that you see on retail centers with doors facing street</p> <p>Table 4.13. Can that connection be gated?</p> <p>Table 4.14. you will have instances where a commercial tenant will only have an entrance to one street (primary), and not be able to do both primary and secondary</p> <p>Table 4.15. There needs to be more flexibility in this requirement for sloping streets.</p> <p>How do you deal with sloped sites where a building has a "split" and adds a lower story to deal with grade, at some point the FFE will be higher than the sidewalk (example new Gateway apartment project uptown by 77 " not that it was detailed well but is an example)</p> <p>Way too little flexibility, some conditions with sloping streets will need flexibility of no minimum.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Building Entry: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p> <p>3/23/2018</p>
<p>i dont understand the percentage transparency, but i do see required windows all over town with stickers over them. enforcement needs to be empowered to fix this item.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Fenestration Design: Please share any questions/comments you have. &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;b&gt;Fenestration&lt;/b&gt; (noun) - the</p> <p>3/19/2018</p>
<p>Fenestration of commercial spaces (stores especially) must not be allowed to be block the transparency of the glazing with the backs of shelving or other display units pushed against the windows from inside. Suggest you specify clear visibility of the interior from the sidewalk of at least 20 feet in depth from the plane of the glazing.</p>		<p>Design Standards - Fenestration Design: Please share any questions/comments you have. &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;b&gt;Fenestration&lt;/b&gt; (noun) - the arrangement of windows and doors on the elevations of a building.</p> <p>3/20/2018</p>
<p>Not sure if Item 19 includes residential. The first floor of residential requires only 25% transparency between 3 feet and 10 feet. This requires 25% transparency of entire wall area.</p>		<p>Design: Please share any questions/comments you have. &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;b&gt;Fenestration&lt;/b&gt; (noun) - the</p> <p>3/21/2018</p>
<p>Fenestration Design</p> <p>-#20 Why is this that bad?</p>		<p>Design Standards - Fenestration Design: Please share any questions/comments you have. &lt;br&gt;</p> <p>3/21/2018</p>



clarify parapets do not count as part of building height.	3/19/2018	Please share any questions/comments you have.
Every building seems to have crappy cornice details today. Suggest deleting this tired neoclassical aesthetic (that's what it is) and simply say that the vertical massing and facade treatment of buildings should always follow the principle of base-middle-top. That is, take care of the ground floor(s) relative to pedestrian accessibility and scale, and the building top floor(s) and edges (with decoration / formal variation / scale or material shift etc) and let the middle stories take care of themselves. Louis Sullivan's doctrine -- still the best today. Can be achieved in any visual style.	3/20/2018	Design Standards - Roof Design: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Table 4.21. Parapets should be excluded from max building height calc.  This actually defines an architectural style, some projects might want a simpler more modern parapet. Too prescribed of a detail (example is 1616 Center)  Policing issue	3/23/2018	Design Standards - Roof Design: Please share any questions/comments you have.
What is the difference between architectural block and architectural block? Confusing, to be sure. A LOT of design prescription for something that you suggest above is more form based! Sounds like it will be all brick and windows. Not much opportunity for design creativity.	3/13/2018	Design Standards - Building Material Restrictions: Please share any questions/comments you have.
sorry brutalism - you are not in fashion anymore. what a shame.	3/19/2018	Design Standards - Building Material Restrictions: Please share any questions/comments you have.
It's sad we can't trust architects to get this right . . .	3/20/2018	Restrictions: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Architectural Materials Following projects could not be built with restrictions -- Camden Gallery, Grandview Towns, Pepsi, 1616 Center, Montage, and so on  Significant comments from multiple people on cost impacts with these requirements -- only material left to build with is masonry or stone  General comment is too formulaic -- won't create great design just make people find materials not on list that are cheaper. There are great EFIS and Hardi materials that can be used  EFIS has a bad rap, and is a very good product, 20% WAY to low for both EFIS and Hardi. Possibly define the type of installation that is preferred instead of material (board and batton, etc)  Need more definition on architectural concrete block, for example many of the "stone" products are actually cast concrete (Grandview Towns for example)  Hardi (need to rename as that is specific product line -- fiber cement) is more about detailing than the actual system  Recommend focusing specific material requirements on ground floor, and not upper floors (tier materials requirements)	3/23/2018	Design Standards - Building Material Restrictions: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Thank you. I'm glad to see that parking is not required in this type of district.	2/28/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
I like where this is going. I feel as though we should go further. Charlotte currently has tons of parking options. These areas should not have public parking available besides along the streets. The less parking the more pedestrians can connect to the streets. Parking structures leave scars and gaps in our neighborhoods that deter people from walkability and transit.	3/8/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>No parking minimums! And keep parking max very low! No surface parking lots! Surface parking lots kill walking! No one wants to walk through a parking lot! Require people to use trains and buses to get in and out of the neighborhood! Say no to private parking! Say NO to parking for workers! Say NO to parking for commuters! Commuters can get in and out by train and bus! If they need to drive to/from home, let their employers buy parking spaces at CARS park-and-ride stations out in the suburbs!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I would not proscribe a maximum for structured. No developer wants to build it anyway, it is way tooo costly. And with all the ride sharing we are all trying to figure out how little parking the public will accept. Also, this restriction will make it hard to build some larger, luxury units and we do want to allow a mix of housing even if we wonâ€™t get much of this.</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>keep the minimums as 0 - helps when discussing the reduced ratios with the banks. i send clips of the code on this all the time.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>for non-residential, consider a buy out option on the minimums. the buy out goes to a city fund used to partner with developers to provide public parking in their decks. this was done on mercury noda. not all sites are big enough for parking decks, but other sites can just add another level. this gives the greatest flexibility. the money would have to be safeguarded though....</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Parking not required - very good</p> <p>I suggest that you take a leaf out of the strategies we wrote into the South End Vision Plan for managed parking rather than parking allocation by individual uses / properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove all minimum parking standards and instead of maximum parking requirements (although some may be valid) require or incentivize shared use of parking spaces between neighboring developments to reduce institutional pressure to construct an excess of spaces.</li> <li>Strongly encourage extensive shared parking arrangements between individual development projects. Develop a strategy and operational plan for sharing and managing parking across whole sections of the TOD-Aneighborhood.</li> <li>This can be continuously updated as new projects come online.</li> <li>In lieu of providing parking to residents or employers, building owners should consider providing the use of car sharing services (e.g., ZipCar, CarShare, Turo), discounted ride sharing services (e.g., Uber, Lyft), or similar shared vehicle service to encourage reduced individual car ownership or usage.</li> <li>Consider pooling parking needs into common decks in adjacent blocks unbundled from buildings. These structures could be constructed by the public or by a third-party private operator, or some combination thereof.</li> <li>Create a self-funding parking management district that manages the parking supply on behalf of public and private owners, including on-street parking, to balance the overall pool throughout the day.</li> <li>Partnerships between the public and private sectors will be vital to the success of this initiative.</li> <li>Offer free parking to retail and entertainment customers during off-peak hours. This should become the norm for all major developments, allowing small site redevelopments to be free of parking requirements.</li> <li>Retrofit existing structures and require that new structures accommodate convenient electric vehicle charging stations.</li> </ul>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Section 1.b.1 I would recommend the reduction of the maximum from 1 surface parking space per dwelling unit to .50 spaces per dwelling unit.</p> <p>Section 2 should be scrapped. Tiering the parking spaces for non-residential uses is confusing and unnecessary. What happens when a restaurant closes and becomes a bar? The new establishment ends up with excess parking. Additionally, the addition of parking along a transit line is contradictory to the goals espoused in the Purpose Statement. We SHOULD NOT INCENTIVIZE PARKING.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Parking Minimums &amp; Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

Section 1.b.4 encourages more parking and will become a loophole for developers to create more parking. They will simply rezone with the 20% for public parking, get it approved, then switch that parking back to private parking after the project has been opened. This is also incentivizing the creation of more parking which is contradictory to the Purpose Statement for TOD-A. The emphasis on parking and parking structures will only allow loopholes for developers to use to build parking. In this way, the TOD-A seems like a text amendment. Additionally, the goals of the Purpose Statement are not being met in this draft ordinance. Planning staff needs to be bolder in its rewriting of this ordinance. We also need a vision for what this process and for this ordinance. Even a set of guiding principles would be helpful, as we currently don't have clear goals or objectives to work toward.	3/20/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Consider not allowing any surface parking in TOD-A.	3/21/2018	Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
For simplicity, consider allowing 4 spaces/1000 square feet of Bar, Live Performance Venue, Nightclub, and Restaurant.	3/21/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Consider requiring signage on the exterior of parking garages indicating if there is public parking.	3/21/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Parking min's are a good compromise as it stands. Can't see these getting much lower. Auto's are not going anywhere until the next ordinance.	3/22/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
<p>Off-Street Parking and Loading</p> <p>(1) Required Vehicle and Bicycle Parking</p> <p>(a) Parking Minimums Support continued practice of having no parking minimums.</p> <p>(b) Parking Maximums</p> <p>1. Recommend reducing parking maximums to 0.5 surface parking space per dwelling unit. In the case of structured parking, dwelling units are limited to a maximum of 1.0 spaces per dwelling unit. This would provide a stronger disincentive for surface parking, which is an extreme under-utilization of valuable land within ¼ of rapid transit stations and should be strongly discouraged if not prohibited to achieve the stated vision for this district. 1.6 spaces per unit is the status quo and is only appropriate in districts not served by other modes of transportation. Developers do not want to build 1.6 spacer per unit, but their investors often require it as part of their checklist based on what has worked in the past. We must give developers leverage in these negotiations with potential investors. When the max is this high, they have no leverage and must build this suburban parking ratio to satisfy investors. The purpose statement and place types state a clear vision for this district, and these rules must ensure implementation of that vision. Allowing every person living within ¼ mile of a rapid transit station to store a private vehicle is not consistent with the stated vision for this district -- so don't allow it! Developers will not advocate for a lower max and will likely oppose, but that's because they don't build for the future, they build for today. The City must ensure we are building with the future in mind, not just today. Afterall, isn't that the purpose of city planning -- to ensure we are building with our future growth in mind?</p> <p>2. Should we have different parking requirements based on usage? Should we consider limit of 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area regardless of usage? Should the focus here be usage when the larger concern is form? Uses change over time and ground floor uses are often unknown at time of design and planning of development. What prevents a landowner from saying they will have a restaurant (allowing 4 spaces per 1,000) and then the use is actually something different that requires less parking? Seems impossible to regulate and again, we should be focused on form, not use.</p> <p>4. Recommend removing section as currently worded as it incentivizes the construction of more parking spaces, allows developers to exceed maximums, and continues to incentivize car use in TOD district. Further, we shared this section with one local developer and his response was: "I don't want to build more parking if I'm allowed 1.6 spaces per</p>	3/23/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
<p>Off Street Parking and Loading 1.B.1 How to handle for dormitories (permitted use) in TODA</p> <p>GENERAL:</p> <p>Image on Page 31-D would suggest illustrating for a street with a 4% slope</p> <p>Image on Page 32-K would suggest illustrating for parking structure treatment</p>	3/23/2018	Parking Minimums & Parking Maximums: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Entered via Bryan Holladay	3/7/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
as noted	3/7/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
Submitted by Bryan Holladay	3/7/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
Submitted by Bryan Holladay	3/7/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)

Developers should have no more than 1/3rd of the "say" in affecting policy and staff recommendations	3/19/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
This purpose statement reflects the high ideas espoused in public by all stakeholders in the city when we discuss development. However, the sample TOD-A ordinance falls short of the ideas put forth by the Purpose Statement	3/20/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
This format is inadequate to comment on the text in its current form. It needs to be offered in a Word format and the responses need to be available to everyone.	3/22/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
Charlotte Center City Partners	3/22/2018	Affiliation Type (You may choose more than one)
Consider assigning Special Use Permitting (S) to Research and Development uses.	2/28/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Should there be a minimum number of units to classify? Counter-point would be that you want to also capture the "missing-middle" here with a smaller # of units on smaller sites.	3/7/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
A townhome is often thought of as any 2 story unit. I would just double check that definition a bit and see what other planning agencies use. I have had towns in high rises. They use that term in NYC I am pretty sure. No yard.	3/13/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Emphasize residential as a part of mixed-use by right, subject to standards of minimum density. As written the draft mandates nothing but apartments. This makes public space design and pedestrian level design exceptionally important. Good design principles here must be mandatory. Don't allow "flexibility" to build the kind of substandard stuff we are used to in South End.	3/19/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
No cars behind bars. EVER.	3/19/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Please clarify why "Bed and Breakfast" uses have been excluded from TOD-A. Why hotel/motel, but no B&Bs? Also, Vehicle Rentals are allowed as a "special use", but Vehicle Dealerships are prohibited. What's to stop a vehicle dealership from classifying as a "vehicle rental" for rezoning, then opening as a dealership. Vehicle rentals should not be allowed either. Also, structured parking should be "special use" only. That special use should be allowed only as a managed parking authority operating a deck for multiple properties. If the implementation of a managed parking authority is not feasible, then this use should NOT be allowed. Why continue to offer incentives to build more parking on a transit corridor?	3/20/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
The Structured Parking Facility should not be allowed in TOD-A. Its inclusion is contradictory to the TOD-A Purpose Statement. Why would we encourage additional driving and parking along such a major transit infrastructure project?	3/20/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
The Structured Parking Facility comment should have and has been moved to the Transportation Uses section.	3/20/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Table 1-Dwelling-Three-Family (Triplex) Single family attached could be appropriate at some stations in Charlotte within 1/4 mile station. also could be appropriate to transition to single family on portion of larger scale project	3/23/2018	Residential Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>Why is Research and Development excluded? Wouldnt these types of companies and users be the type of tenants most likely to incorporate the items on the Bonus Menu? Wouldnt these types of employees be preferable if the city wants to activate the neighborhood with pedestrian and bike traffic? Also, less likely to use cars.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Food vendors are required to have trash cans, but not recycling cans. In fact, why not go crazy and give them an incentive to reduce waste generation. For example, if they use reusable containers and utensils, they can have much smaller cans. And while we are on trash and recycling, all buildings should be required to include space for trash and recycling appropriate for their use; and include food waste. Ask the Solid Waste People to help you with the details</p>	<p>3/11/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No parking for commercial uses! Workers can commute by train and bus! Zero parking for workers!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Emphasize commercial as a part of mixed-use by right subject to requirements for pedestrian street level / public space design. Absolutely REQUIRE transparency at ground level on street frontages. No blocked off sales windows etc. Clear visual relationships between inside and outside are vital for public safety.</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I would definitely allow Research and Development by right. Just think of Kendal Square on Boston's red line where MIT and Google have a huge presence.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I believe a Broadcast Facility - No Antennae should require a special use approval as it probably will not generate enough foot traffic to belong in a TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The Open Air Fresh Food Market might be a special use. It seems that it would make more sense for a Public Park to have a temporary farmers' market as an ancillary use.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Vehicle Dealership - Enclosed could potentially be a special use. I saw a proposal for a Tesla dealership on a busy pedestrian thoroughfare in Miami Beach (Lincoln Road). like Miami Beach, the special use would only allow a limited inventory and no servicing or repair of vehicles.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Research and Development might be a special use especially if any TOD-A districts are near UNCC. The high salaries of people working in these locations could generate opportunities for the adjacent restaurants, etc. (see Kendall Square in Cambridge, MA)</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Table 1: Use Matrix Switch from Structured Parking to Paired to S. That would make it consistent with Vehicle Rental.</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Table 1-Research and Development: There are many different types of R&amp;D firms. Technical (software) vs industrial. This should be permitted as a special use. Table 1-Self Storage Facility: Enclosed use could be appropriate as part of underground space in parking deck or below building (for example Harding office project in rezoning) so long as it is not viewable from street or even some underground storage concepts emerging Table 1-Vehicle Rental: Vehicle showroom?? Have seen some nice Ferrari/Lambo / Tesla storefronts in urban areas. should be special permit</p>	<p>3/23/2018</p>	<p>Commercial Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>There should be a provision for building schools in TOD-A areas, so that families aren't pushed out and students have access to schools without using CMS's buses.</p>	<p>2/28/2018</p>	<p>Institutional and Governmental Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Would exclude Public Works.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Institutional and Governmental Uses: Please share any</p>

No parking for institutions! Workers can commute by train and bus! Zero parking for workers! It's not transit-oriented or truly walkable if we build this area for driving!!	3/12/2018	Institutional and Governmental Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Emphasize these uses as a part of mixed-use by right subject to requirements for pedestrian street level / public space design.	3/20/2018	Institutional and Governmental Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
As a former Public Works employee, I would not want any of my facilities in a TOD-A as the maintenance would be very disruptive to the public. It might make sense to not even allow it in order to avoid future debates about the requirements of a special use approval.	3/21/2018	Institutional and Governmental Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
No comment.	3/7/2018	Public Health & Social Services Uses: Please share any
Emphasize these uses as a part of mixed-use by right subject to requirements for pedestrian street level / public space design.	3/20/2018	Public Health & Social Services Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Why would you exclude a parking lot as an option? Understood you would not want these everywhere but it could be an option for the city to designate certain areas for parking (Decks or otherwise) so that there can be input on where these go.	3/7/2018	Transportation Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
No parking for workers! Workers can commute by train and bus! If workers need to drive to/from home, have their employers buy them parking spaces at CATS park-and-ride lots! Zero parking for commuters! They can take the train and bus! If we allow parking and driving into these areas, then they're not truly transit-oriented nor truly walkable! No parking for workers!	3/12/2018	Transportation Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
No surface parking! No one wants to walk through a parking lot! Do not allow surface parking lots to destroy the neighborhood! Parking lots and parking decks encourage driving and actively discourage walking! If you want this to be truly walkable and truly transit-oriented, say no surface parking!	3/12/2018	Transportation Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
OK guys. I'm truly dissatisfied now having gone this far with all this text. For heaven's sake, please get over this old-fashioned fetishization of use. This is not a code rewrite in this form! It's making to nothing more than a text amendment ground out through thinking that is so far behind the times it's almost laughable. Get hold of a good form based code and see how it handles uses by means of tables. Please!  This way of thinking is so discouraging. I don't allow this thinking/ formatting in my classes as it's so out of date. It's demoralizing to see it still at the front of your minds here.	3/20/2018	Transportation Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Table 1-Drive Through Facility should be allowed inside enclosed deck, need neighborhood retail and services close to station (pharmacy, bank, grocer, etc.) Shared society and 'uber' world has created more need for delivery services. Table 1-Parking Lot (Principal Use) Existing parking lots on phased projects? Or projects that are zoned but not developed yet? Many times this is only form of public parking. for example in NoDa if you voluntarily rezone all parcels to TOD-A the existing surface public lots would need to close (one on 35th street)	3/23/2018	Transportation Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
No comment.	3/7/2018	Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.
Actually, should the city get ahead of the curve here and purchase the land where these parks would fit with the overall plan?	3/7/2018	Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.

<p>I question whether a community garden is an appropriate use for a TOD-A. Perhaps the other TODs (e.g. suburban TOD) , but space close to transit needs to help pay for (justify, if you will) the transit. It's too precious for a garden, which could be just outside it perhaps, a mere 1/4 mile away. Farmstands, maybe. If you insist on including them, limit their size and direct the location to the fringe.</p>	<p>3/8/2018</p>	<p>Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>city parks and large public parks should be an allowed use, though low density</p>	<p>3/19/2018</p>	<p>Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I might as well say this at this point . . I'm reading the text in parallel with the relevant Place Type documents and the problems with the Place Types as Policy approach and the code as the nitty gritty becomes more and more apparent as the code is all detail which is hard to evaluate on its own. If I didn't have the Place Type open as well, relatively little makes sense in terms of how to evaluate the content. By what standards and to what goals are we evaluating these proposals??</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I feel very strongly that a community garden is not appropriate in a TOD-A. It would likely be small and serve only a few members of the public at any one time. As a result, it would be an area that is effectively off-limits to the majority of the residents and all those who work and visit the TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Open Spaces Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>No comment.</p>	<p>3/7/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>I am not sure if this is the best spot to leave this comment but I see no where in this document that puts an emphasis on biking. The fronts of building should include the option for "potholes" that include adding bike lanes or pedestrian infrastructure to the streets. Just like developers have had to add parking they should be paying to build pedestrian/biking infrastructure to mitigate the years of parking and unworkable sidewalks that have been built in charlotte.</p>	<p>3/8/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>If you really want people to use the trains and buses to get in and out of the area, then do not allow off-street parking! Parking decks and lots everywhere encourages driving and actively discourages walking! No one wants to walk through a parking lot! That's why no one walks between stores at a shopping center. No parking for workers! No surface parking lots!</p>	<p>3/12/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Consider making the Public Utility (includes Transmission and Distribution) a special use. This would give more control over where these could potentially be located.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Not sure if types of fencing are required or prohibited, but article (b) 2. requires a fence. Chain link fence should not be allowed in a TOD-A.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Under Bicycle-Sharing Station 1. and 2., it would seem that even a partial encroachment onto public property would require an encroachment agreement from CDOT.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Infrastructure Uses: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>Density bonus are not a BIG IDEA. Sorry. We and others have had the for years and we are getting almost NO HOUSING from them. Giving developers the opportunity to build more expensive (taller) housing will not drive the costs down in such a way as to make affordable work. Further, 60% affordability will simply not happen in market rate housing without significant incentives, at least given the income levels in CLT. The industry has given the City Manager a list of low hanging fruit to jump start affordable housing. This is not it, but I appreciate the effort.</p>	<p>3/13/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - General Comments: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>

<p>What is TOD-R? Typo for TOD-A?          If so you have my sympathy. My response has typos also - that the damn form wont let me go back and correct!          The HUGE thing missing here are DIAGRAMS. I would put that word in neon letters 10 feet high if I could.</p> <p>Form-based Codes are predicated on diagrams and illustrations.</p> <p>PLEASE rethink this.</p> <p>Meanwhile, in your text there are several, odd things.          Why is there a maximum height in your densest area? No logic behind this unless deep down you're scared of big buildings.          Urban design teaches us that height is much less important than what happens at the pedestrian base and at the building crown. The point of form-based codes is that it gives you the opportunity, nay, the obligation to think like a designer.</p> <p>Height setbacks against residential? What kind of residential. You are only allowing apartment buildings. Seems odd, even unnecessary.</p> <p>#0 feet min separation between structures?? automatically makes small and intimate urban alleys illegal. The much-loved and mourned Common Market courtyard and alley off Camden Road wouldn't be allowed.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - General          Comments: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>The heights for Maximum Building Heights with Bonus should be increased from 250' to unlimited. Limiting a highly urbanized area to buildings that are between 20-25 stories seems like a missed opportunity. I could see the 250' limit being a halfway point between 65' and the unlimited height. However, the unlimited height should be restrictive and difficult to achieve unless specific goals are contractual met, not speculatively met as they are in the current zoning process.</p>	<p>3/20/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - General          Comments: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>TOD-A districts should be some of the most dense and most intense in the city. All the standards should be geared to allow density and encourage pedestrian activity.</p>	<p>3/21/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - General          Comments: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>
<p>i'm very much in favor of the 'in lieu of' option and like where the approach to the Bonus Menu</p>	<p>3/22/2018</p>	<p>Dimensional Standards - General          Comments: Please share any questions/comments you have.</p>