

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/24/2021	30.1 Purpose	<p>Under "Purpose" (30.1-C-1), I'm kind of confused at the wording of the statement. It reads as if the goals will primarily serve economic development which mainly serves business entities, the city, then the citizens. If the city wants its residents (both present and future) to believe they care about them, then I think it's important to come off in a way that signals a priority for residential quality of life, especially if the individual does not have two pennies to rub together. Something like: "Expanded transportation options, each of which should naturally feel safe and intuitive, will serve as a catalyst to an improved quality of life and thus economic development for all." The goal of this sort of wording is to say that, someone can safely get to work even they become physically disabled or they lost their mode of transportation. If they also lost their source of income, then their ability to move around and continue their life shall not be restricted to spaces reserved for cars. I understand that this is a legal document, but should there not be some kind of "up-selling" language to hold feet to the fire?</p>
12/7/2021	30.1 Purpose	<p>How will development permitting be processed to determining capacity /impacts to: public school air quality stormwater road capacity water/sewer service open space & parks</p> <p>These matters are imperative to comprehensive growth management & whether development is permitting that is compatible the Comprehensive Plan/desired outcome.</p>
11/27/2021	30.2 Applicability	<p>I appreciate the acknowledgement that these standards don't work in the ETJ (Or City NCDOT roads) but this one sentence 491 pages into the document just sets up a Conflict for every ETJ project. CDOT already knows that NCDOT will not accept the Arterial cross sections so why propose them in the ETJ? (I have an NCDOT email to prove it). CDOT should write the CRT/ guidelines to comply with NCDOT not pretend they might comply & leave the property owners in limbo (e.g. Grand Palisades Parkway which is 15+ years trying to get NCDOT to accept the road))</p>
11/27/2021	30.2 Applicability	<p>section 30.2 B acknowledges that Schools are exempt from some standard but omits what should be item D.: that Municipalities can not compel any offsite improvements (See Court of Appeals ruling Buckland v. Town of Haw River 12/29/2000) This applies to Article 33 and CTR Mitigation requirements which are offsite</p>
11/27/2021	31.10 Drainage	<p>31.10 needs to remove the word 'infrastructure'. Not all drainage systems are accomplished through infrastructure. it could be swales, for example</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	31.11 No Service Unless Street Accepted or Tentatively Approved	31.11 needs to be corrected. Water and Sewer lines are accepted for maintenance separately for the road (remove from the list). City Council doesn't approve streets - its an Administrative function (delegated)
11/27/2021	31.12 Standards and Specifications	31.12 erosion control is not a minimum standard- i.e. if you don't grade over an acre there would be no requirement by Law or Ordinance for an EC plan.
11/27/2021	31.12 Standards and Specifications	Merging final plat approval wit street acceptance is confusing. They are two separate steps sometimes years apart. Make into 2 sections.
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 A. 1. NCDOT has not agreed to the Arterial road standards & there are provisions for when an existing road need not be moved that are not referenced here.
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 B. does not comply with Court case Buckland Vv. Haw River (2000) wherein the City can not compel offsite roadway improvements
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 F. needs the words 'where applicable' added to the end of the last sentence. State law does not allow maintenance bonds for all improvements
11/12/2021	31.2 Block and Network Design Standards	Cul-de-sac are great for neighborhood. This fosters neighborhood gathering areas and kids to play.
11/27/2021	31.3 Types of Subdivisions	Section 31.1 A (the second #1) says NST plats are subject to Article 16.1. NO THEY ARE NOT. You can not require elevated walks or review of structures in easements . the stat law is clear-- when you are NOT SUBJECT TO the ordinance- it means the whole ordinance
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 A removed the notation about railroad crossing (appears to be moved to page 32-4.) it needs to be in this section for clarity
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 B- when the other side of the half street is owned by someone else (likely)the city can not compel that owner to sell or allow the construction except through condemnation. This section should layout the requirements that the City can require the other half of street be built if the City will condemn. failure to condemn means no half street construction (supported by General statute & case law)
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 E - you must remove 'arterial' as a required classification for parallel roads. Or you have to identify the roads you want to prohibit access & pay the property owners for that loss of access rights like NCDOT does.
11/27/2021	31.6 Preliminary Plan Requirements	31.6 A.. omitted open space (which is not the same thing as greenways) existing public parks, open space, or greenways
11/27/2021	31.6 Preliminary Plan Requirements	31.6 A. #12 & #14 are information not likely known at time of Preliminary Plat. They also are not necessary for a review of the Preliminary plat

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	31.7 Final Plat Requirements	31.7 B- again-- why is height and use and location something to show on a plat. There is a building pad area that tells you location (Subject to the odd language on Table 29-2 allowing [staff] to tell you to MOVE a proposed structure) if you have to list land uses then you have to go through the expensive & timely process of preparing & reviewing a revised final plat to change use. Why? you get change of use permits at the County not city. Alternative is to list all allowed uses & that is ridiculous.
11/27/2021	31.7 Final Plat Requirements	And what happens overtime when the improvements in a Common Area changes? does that also require a new expensive final plat because they want to add another bench or trash can?
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 B.2. has a general list of things you say you can mandate a reservation of land. No statutory reference is provided. in a presentation to City Council the slide referred to reservation for police stations- listed no where in this UDO.
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	provide statutory authority to throw out time lines for a staff-driven review (with reservation)
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 D. - how is an approval of a Final Plat called tentative approval? when is it not tentative? once approved it is usually signed & taken to the Register of Deeds. It is not Tentative
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 .E. #3. what other agency. Please be specific. Give examples.
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8.H. does this section need to change for the DSTAC discussion on Early Grading?
10/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1(D): Add recognition that historic buildings/character could be reasons for exceptions.
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 table 32-1 removed the preferred block length for creek crossings. it needs to be explicitly here
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 B.2.d. iii needs to include the exemption for not requiring stub roads to properties that can not be subdivided (e.g. those with deed restrictions)
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 C. 3 a. needs to add that roads parallel to adjacent developed uses should not be in the calculation (e.g. you don't stub to a 26 acre school so you end up with a long road);

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	drawing on page 32-5 doesn't use the same wording as page 21-11. is it not ca Buffer Landscape yard?
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 G. needs to also be subject to the Exceptions in section D on previous page. . Exceptions (D) should be the last in the alphabetical list.
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 H - Half street construction needs to spell out that if the City won't condemn then the City can't mandate the construction;
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. Cross access removes buffers & should specifically say that no buffer / landscape planting are required.
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. 2 needs to specifically exempt One- and Two-Family Homes.
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. 5. needs to provide for the likely occurrence that the adjacent owner doesn't want the cross access & won't sign anything
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3. A. The CSManual requires driveways to be 10' from the property line- if on an Arterial which is impossible. Visualize Scaleybank & tell me how it works. You want attached housing but you can't get driveways 10' from the property line.
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	Driveway permits need to be part of the Preliminary Plan approval. not a different approval step
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3 B. c. Because storm drainage inlets are on the property line (when they run between lots) the wording needs to better define ' conflict with or negatively impact'
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3 B.1. e. says 200' and 32.3 B 2 b says 150' . Which is it?. What if it's 160' ?
11/27/2021	33.1 Transportation Impact Study (TIS)	You call 33.1 a TIS but the Draft calls it CTR. which is in error?
11/27/2021	33.1 Transportation Impact Study (TIS), 33.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	33.1B and 33.2.B use word Threshold but the CTR calls them Tiers. Be consistent. Threshold is better are there are other items called tiers in the UDO
11/27/2021	33.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	33.2 E. 2. sets the limit for a Collector Road at 1 dua since ii and iii would never be reached (given that the sentence structure says 'or') Collector roads should not be that prevalent. Local streets lower vehicular speeds.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 B.1. e violates state law when it requires improvement of a Bus Stop Amenity on the other side of the right-of-way
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 shifting the burden for an entire CATS system upgrade & expansion to those who don't live here yet is awful. Why do transit riders pay fares? Why do we pay property taxes?. If it's important than the riders & citizenry should pay for it.
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 C. 1. a. i. the MCT adopted Transit Service plans needs to be available for review (it is NOT on the supporting document page)
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 C. 11. a. ii. the threshold of 300 trips is a fraction of the # of trips it would take to actually develop a new rider. 3000 trips is more appropriate. similarly 33.5 C 2.b. i. - the requirement for 2 new bus stops with 2500 traffic count is too much of a stretch. that few traffic count will not generate the people to use that many bus shelters.
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5.C. 2.c. the spacing of 1/4 mile (1320 ft) is too close. the traffic back up with a bus stopping every quarter of a mile will be a disaster
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 C.3 d. where are the MTC Transit Service Guidelines (not in the supporting documents)
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	where are the CATS Bus Stop Special Details?
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	Does NCDOT allow bus stops / stopping buses every 1/4 mile?
11/12/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	Residential Narrow is not in the Draft UDO, this is an important street type in small residential neighborhood.; 8' planting strips are too wide. This increases the width of the ROW. This is another land taking.
11/27/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	33.6 C. requiring reservation of all Arterials (FKA Minor thoroughfares) is a serious property taking - especially for housing of any format. For every mile or road it's a taking of an additional 4.36 acres- off the tax rolls and not available for the density the 2040 Plan envisioned
11/27/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	33.6 A- construction of a new road for a building permit is excessive. #2 needs to be deleted
11/27/2021	33.7 Required Off-Street Public Paths	33.7 E. where is the detail for the width & construction standards for these off street paths. Item 4 leaves it open ended & it should not be. What are the accommodations needed for the extra tree clearing.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8(B)(2)(b)(iv): This is a significant disincentive to adding outdoor dining to historic buildings.
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 A. 1. The CTR can not require offsite improvement. it can not require road improvements for a NST plat. It should not require improvements on roads in the ETJ
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8A.1.e will dissuade people from doing reuse of existing (sometimes abandoned) big box centers. why make it harder when we want the services in these older neighborhoods?
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8A.2. Exemptions- makes no sense. is it the addition of 25% new BUA, or the total site has >25% BUA. Please re-write
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 B 2.c. NCDOT has lots of complaints about the odd extra lane being used for tractor trailer parking. #c should be rewritten to NOT require the lane in NCDOT roads unless requested by NCDOT
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8. 3 (relocation) is way too much of an overreach. Add to your home and you move the curb & storm drainage. WOW. Take a building upfit permit on an old commercial center & move the curb & piping which causes the loss of a row of parking spots, that's awful. this whole section needs to be revisited and toned down.
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	why on 33-8-A 1 do i have to move the ditch line back with associated piping & Curb (on NCDOT street) but if its existing (Section 33-8 3.3 ii A (page 33-10)
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	section 3 on page 33-9 conflicts with section 39.3 non-conforming structures
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	bottom of page 33-10 - is the city really going to prohibit on-street parking on collector & local roads? How
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	item B. 1 on page 33-11 needs a drawing to make this section clear.
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	page 33-14 item 1.d. 'documented and confirmed' site constraints? how?
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	and why only transmission structures? what about electrical distribution structures?? what about other Utility constraints? Why only power?
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	there is not enough nexus for the building of a bank to require the entire private road network of the larger Activity Center to be #2 page 33-12 rebuilt. Limit the improvements to onsite & proportional

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	table 33-3 in areas <10' >8' are trees not allowed in the 'remaining space'?
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	page 33-14 item c above table 33-4. Why would there ever be an improvement required for an Existing Building. ; items d and e below table 33-4 highlight how you can write a sentence acknowledging 3+ conflicting goals but not solve the problem. Yove made us build a sea of impervious pavement, but you know the trees have to be planted. And you've ignored you killed other trees when the additional impervious requires an increased storm water basin.
10/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	Table 34-4: wider sidewalks are not always better, particularly when combined with curb and gutters, 11' drive lanes, setbacks, amenity zones, etc.
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	34.3 A days dimensions but the table has no dimensions
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	table 34-2 why is Collector road omitted?
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	table 34-3 the 8' amenity zone needs to be centered in the row if it applies to a// street classifications
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	note #4 & % below table 34-3 conflicts with page 29-9 (trees 10' from utilities). Either or both need additional clarity
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	page 34-4 references a Transit Trail Plan. Where is it? not on supporting document page
11/27/2021	34.4 Off-Street Public Paths	34.4 B & C. it is assumed the connection is a property width not the pavement width. Provide clarity
11/27/2021	34.5 Cross-Access	34.C 1.a.Are trees considered obstacles when adjacent to a ped/bike connection? If so that is an extra acre of grading every 8/10's of an acres. What is the value in that extra 10' of clearing?
11/27/2021	35.1 Drainage	35.1 storm drainage is not always 'installed'. maybe 'constructed' is a better word .
12/29/2021	35.2 Water Supply; 35.3 Wastewater Sewer	<p>Hello, my name is James Kissmer. My family operates a business focused on development of infill lots, typically small lots that once had a house on them. I noticed the current proposed UDO does not speak to Water and Sewer development fees. I'd like to recommend they be included, as these fees, though available to be found on the Charlotte Water site, could use to be more transparent and hosted in the primary UDO document.</p> <p>I'd also like to recommend these fees be adjusted to a sliding scale based on square footage of the dwelling. My understanding is that a major goal of the UDO is to address the rapidly developing housing crisis in our city. A standard connection/development fee of \$11,617 (currently) is simply too high to spur the development of small, affordable houses (<1,000 sqft), and too low to account for the disproportionate water and sewer usage of large, unaffordable houses (>3,000sqft), the development of which surely will not alleviate the crisis we find our city in.</p> <p>My family's business is not adversely affected by the current development fees from an economic perspective, but rather from a moral perspective. There are dozens of lots in dozens of historically discriminated-against neighborhoods that could have small, affordable houses built on them. But instead they sit vacant, overgrown, because no 850sqft house is economically feasible, and no 3,500sqft house will fit on a 50x150 lot. Please consider a reduced fee, even a waived fee, for smaller houses, and please consider an increased fee for large houses that continue to make Charlotte unaffordable for the low and middle-class.</p> <p>All the best, James</p>