

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	23.1 Purpose	note that all of the choices for section #'s say Article 23 but this is article 26
11/12/2021	23.10 Definitions	23.10 BMP, the draft UDO would require Performance Bonds posted before the work is preformed and no CO's until it is as-built. Are you trying to put homebuilders out of business!
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	CA-2 and CA-3 and PA2 & PA 3 were removed. Why?
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	23.4A.1.a.viii says SCM which is defined as structural BMPs. confirm non-structural BMPs are still allowed
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	page 23-4 allowed uses under prescribed conditions include today: LCID offsite, landfill, wastewater treatment. Why were these removed. Home many properties are affected by this elimination?
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	page 23-5 B. 1 & 2. And page 23-6 b--SCM's should be allowed to be used for BUA credit. that is a option that has value to the environment & should not be eliminated.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	confirm you have removed the density cap as evidenced in table 23-1
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	what is the environmental purpose of eliminating the 70% and 12% options in the Mountain Island watershed?
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	table 23-3 makes no allowance for a road design with out curb & gutter? why?
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	23.6 Mtn island buffers were reduced in PA2 & eliminated in PA3 as they were farther from the lake edge. what is the reason for not allowing that when you're miles from the lake edge?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	Section 4 top of page 23-9 if you have a site specific mitigation plan then you don't need a variance. it should be OR not AND
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	pg 23-9 4.a. the last sentence conflicts with page 23-10 (if residential)
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	page 23-9 D - # 3 needs to allow for Utility lines in the buffer
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	B on page 23-10 is nonsense> if i don't have a grading permit (aka permit) then I have nothing to post a surety on. State law only requires a performance surety if i want to plat prior to completion. getting a grading permit is not a plat. You also changed the as-built to the first home. For what purpose? don't you want to see it work & have the as-built after the repair. 75% of the development is a better indicator that it works & needs an as-built

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	23.2 Applicability; 23.3 Areas and Sub-Areas Established; 23.4 Uses and Activities; 23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements; 23.10 Definitions	23.10 all definitions need to be in ARTICLE 2. and you ignored the agricultural exemption by state law
11/5/2021	23.6 Water Quality Buffer Requirements	Lots recorded before 1998 are exempt from the SWIM and PCCO requirements. It needs to be clarified that sub-lotting to allow duplexes or triplexes shall not be considered as subdivision that would trigger compliance with SWIM and PCCO requirements. This is important to be able to provide affordable ownership opportunities. You can build a duplex and sell it to a single owner on a lot recorded before 1998 but if you want to be able to sell 1/2 of a duplex there is confusion that the sub-lotting triggers compliance with SWIM, PCCO. This clarification needs to happen in the UDO and also in administration of the current ordinance.
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	24.2 is a very big over-reach. I add a 120 sq ft bedroom and i have to hire an engineer & pay to submit a plan. For what benefit?
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	24.2 B specifically says SDE (not previously defined) and NOT PSDE. why is that?
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	the requiremetn for a new engineered plan when CDOT requires a driveway in a specific location is trapping the property owner between 2 departments.
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	For what reason is it 10' the easements are generally 15' wide (current rules)
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	24.3 A. b should be allowed to be 7.5 feet unless the conditions of section (i) are met.
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	24.3 A c is increasing the ditch easements form 15', 20' or 25' to a blanket 20' For what reason? should not the improvement and the drainage basin be a criteria? (see also section B #6)

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	24.3 A 2- appears to make silt sacks a unlawful activity
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	page 24-3 item C #2- why are uninhabitable crawl spaces included in a list of habitable portions of structures?
11/27/2021	24.2 Applicability; 24.3 Storm Drainage Standards	item 4 a on the same page has a typo. it should read: the SWEL does not ENCROACH INTO the required minimum front....
44571	25.1 Purpose	<p>As a long time volunteer cleaning up at schools, parks, roadways and neighborhood, it is very clear the last 2 years as the population increases, we have a wide variety of behavior and increase in food convenience.</p> <p>I think there is a broader need for municipalities to lobby industry/media to discourage one-time use packaging. But I feel it urgent we consider mandatory retrofit controls for water and litter onsite to hold originating site or businesses responsible. There are individual parking lot/street drain cleanouts for under \$100 per drain.</p> <p>Unfortunately we receive a great deal from an adjacent shopping center that has seen expansion with more on the way that ties into our lake system. I don't believe our HOA understood this many years ago and our lakes/drainage pipes were not built for that. We also get a lot of sediment caused by public and 3rd party runoff we have reported with little assistance there as well as from street drains and a middle school near another pond of ours.</p> <p>I'm sure we aren't the only neighborhood with this issue but we do have a lot of lakes.</p>
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	25.2 As written A.and A.1. violate Vesting Law & Permit Choice & Grandfathering laws. Remove the 7/1/2008 date to fix half the problem.
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	page 25-2 starts the list with #'s but it is continuing a list of letters so # 2-6 become C to G.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	Letter E (was 3) removes all vesting. it's illegal
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	letter E (was 4) has too low of a threshold. should be 20,000 sq ft New BUA not 5,000
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	Item D.1. b. iii on page 25-3 (no BUA within 15' top of bank) conflicts with table 26.2 allowing road crossings
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	#2.d.iii conflicts with the table 26-2
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	page 25-6 F.1.b.iii conflicts with the table 26-2
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	25.5 section 4 c. iii has typo. it is correctly.... shall be maintained BY THE CITY in perpetuity

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	25.2 Applicability; 25.3 Stormwater Management Permit Standards; 25.5 Mitigation Options; 25.10 Definitions	25.10 definitions should be in Article EXCEPT that the definition of residential development or redevelopment appears to try to differential between housing that is for sale & that which is for rent. that differentiation is not appropriate. it should be reworded
12/1/2021	26.1 Purpose	A stream runs through a portion of our property, and our survey identified a SWIM buffer extending to an area over which we intend to expand our house. When we purchased the property, we were assured that it was exempt from the City of Charlotte Post Construction Storm Water Ordinance. Will this exemption remain after the implementation of the UDO?
11/27/2021	26.3 SWIM Water Quality Buffer Standards	26.3 drawing for calculation for additional 50% area needs shading or another way to make it clearer.
11/27/2021	26.5 Mitigation	26.5 first line says Shall be required then B is when it isn't required. the first line should be changed from 'shall be' to 'is'
11/27/2021	26.5 Mitigation	26.5 why were all of the mitigation incentives removed?
11/27/2021	27.5 Floodplain Development Permits and Certification Requirements ; 27.8 Definitions	item G page 27-15 implies that a permit is not vested conflicting with Item E on page 27-2
11/27/2021	27.5 Floodplain Development Permits and Certification Requirements ; 27.8 Definitions	27-8 all definitions should be in Article 2.
11/27/2021	27.5 Floodplain Development Permits and Certification Requirements ; 27.8 Definitions	Burying a change in FPE from 1 foot to 2 foot in the definitions is dirty pool. And then submitting a different ordinance change to Council for review while this one is being reviewed is worse. Who's on first? What game are we playing?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	top if page 28-3 #6 should read Manage Stormwater Runoff (not management)
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	item C. 4. top lie needs to have inserted. Whenever land-disturbing activity is undertaken on a tract THAT DISTURBS MORE THAN ONE ACRE, the person...
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	top of page 28-5 #4 first line needs to say ACCELERATED erosion and sedimentation in order to comply with state law
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	section 28.4 A. 1. reference is incorrect it should be 28.3.A.2
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	page 28-6 #2 b conflicts with the top of page 28-9.
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	top of page 2-7 c ii. should say set forth in item 28.4.A.1 (not just item 1)

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	page 28-8 B 1. b. should say the exceptions to the requirements for a PERMIT is land -disturbing activity....
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	top of page 28-9 one year conflicts with three year on page 29-6
11/27/2021	28.3 Requirements, Objectives, and Standards; 28.4 Plans and Permits; 28.7 Definitions	Definitions should all be in Article 2. In state law 'person responsible' is called Person who Violates or Violator'
11/9/2021	29.1 Purpose	As someone living in the community, not just developing it, I support tree saves in all zoning/development sites, including TOD. Preserving and expanding Charlotte's tree canopy is essential to preserving the city's appeal and livability now and in the future
11/27/2021	29.1 Purpose; 29.2 Authority and Applicability; 29.5 Green Area; 29.9 Administrative Adjustments and Emergencies	over-reach into the ETJ not authorized by S.L. 1975-115 which says it 'applies only to the City of Charlotte'
11/27/2021	29.2 Authority and Applicability	page 29-2 again over reaches into ETJ. and removed exemption for One- and Two-family dwellings (old ordinance 21-4 (3))
11/27/2021	29.2 Authority and Applicability	pg 2*2- B 1. a. is it i, ii, iii cumulative OR individually?
11/27/2021	29.2 Authority and Applicability	iii does not apply to plats that are Not Subject to the is ordinance
11/27/2021	29.2 Authority and Applicability	page 29-2 B. 3. a. last sentence removes vested rights. sentence needs to be deleted

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/12/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	Permit to remove trees on private property, you have got to be kidding. See NC General Status 153A-205.4
11/12/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	Pine Trees are not Heritage Trees
11/15/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	Trees zoned in residential private property should not be protected by the city through legislation. It is simply too much to oversee and handle: property owners should be allowed to do what is best for the property. Trees and the Charlotte canopy can be protected in other ways. If it was required to fill out a form for trees removed from the property, the city could know how many more trees needed to be planted in new developments and property owners can be given authority to make the best decision for their own property.
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	page 29-3 C. is an unprecedented over-reach into citizens back yards. and then you go on to try to protect domestic animals. Back it way down guys
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	C. 3. would prohibit overseed of winter grass, planting of flowers, repair of existing irrigation. this is a very big property right taking
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	page 29-4. a \$20,000 fine for failure to get a permit is ABSURD
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	what are the time limits to get the permit?. what are the conditions under which a permit could be denied?
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	page 29-5 E. permits-- is that building permits or CO's?
11/27/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	the Heritage Tree add-on document page 1 appears to conflict with UDO section 29-2B2

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
12/16/2021	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	i actually wrote the mayor and all council members last month of my concerns over this law. my home property has many old trees, none of which are in greatest health. i spend thousands every year as it is on tree care and removal and face yet more in coming years. to now face permit requirements for necessary removals is going to be a disincentive to be proactive. and none of the council folks who responded to me said anything about mitigation. i was told by them that removal due to sickness, death or recognized danger would be exempt from permitting. now i feel i was lied to. i don't believe individuals are behind unnecessary tree loss. i feel they're covering up now for developers who's land clearings i see every time we drive anywhere. this passes I'll vote against every local incumbent.
1/3/2022	29.3 Maintenance and Protection of Trees	<p>Section 29.3.C.5.a.ii says that Heritage Tree protection is required unless "Preservation of the tree would unreasonably restrict use of the property." I fully support the heritage tree preservation, but I'd like more guidance on the process of obtaining a TWP if a heritage tree is restricting the site.</p> <p>-Will a test fit or concept plan be required with the TWP application to prove that there is no other reasonable location for a conflicting building or driveway? What level of detail is expected?</p> <p>-Will multiple iterations be required to demonstrate that the proposed building location is necessary?</p> <p>In general I think the new UDO is very streamlined and I appreciate the clarity! Thank you for prioritizing tree preservation.</p>
11/12/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	Tree surveys are very costly.
11/27/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	29.4 A and B.1-- a tree survey is an unnecessary expenditure of money. the aerals used now adequately show the tree line. the tree save areas are shown by metes & bounds on the final plat. And further protected with orange tree fence until inspection release. requiring that level of survey provides no additional data to the City, in addition the definition of Canopy on page 2-10 say s aerial
11/27/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	29.4 B.2. a. should e 8" trees not 3" trees
11/27/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	Charlotte Tree Manual is not defined
11/27/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	29.4 C tree As-builts are not needed as the city already gets the metes & bounds location on all record plats
11/27/2021	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	29.4 D. do you mean Green Area when you say tree save?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/6/2022	29.4 Plan Submittal and Process	Hi UDO Team, my name is Andy Lucas and I'm participating in the UDO developer engagement sessions. I was reviewing the tree ordinance portion this evening and have two comments from a development perspective. The first relates to the tree as-builts. You probably have heard this from others, but the idea of adding yet another survey scope of work to our plates has a meaningful impact. It adds several thousand dollars to our total project costs, ties up a very thin pool of already overwhelmed surveyors in the community, and the idea that it is tied to our C/O puts us at significant risk. A walk with our Urban Forestry inspector along with a printed copy of the approved plan should suffice, and it makes practical sense given the field changes we encounter throughout a particular development. Please consider removing this requirement. The second comment I have relates to tree needing to be 10 feet from all underground utilities. We develop a lot of urban infill townhome projects, and with the proliferation of these types of communities in the city, I can tell you that it's nearly impossible to maintain this distance considering how busy the utility plan must be. The same is true of dense apartment projects. We have gas, water, sewer, telecom, irrigation, and power that all need to fit underground, and then water meters, sewer cleanouts, irrigation meters, power pedestals and transformers, and telecom vaults and pedestals that are placed aboveground. I would suggest considering 5' or 7' of spacing as an alternative, or providing us with the option to place any trees in conflict elsewhere on the site instead of relying on the sole discretion of the Chief Forester. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I will continue to send as I review. Best, Andy
10/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	29.5(B) How does this work?
10/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	29.5(D): No structure is very rigid outside the tree save area. A bench? A sign?
10/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	29.5(D)(10)(c): these are VERY small trees - is this all that the City wants to require?
11/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	table 29-2 would require that an inspector visit every single building permit in the city & dispute the location of a structure. Structure locations are set within a building pad. this added City step is ABSURD
11/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	how do you amenitize a tree area (a good idea) and not disturb it? I know its possible but this document alludes that it isn't
11/27/2021	29.5 Green Area	Green Area - Off Site Mitigation supplemental documentation why is off-site mitigation not allowed for single family?;
12/12/2021	29.5 Green Area	In section 29.5 B, it states that 15% or more of a site is subject to Article 29. Will the minimum level of 15% help the city reach the possible tree canopy levels identified in the 2014 report conducted by the Spatial Analysis Laboratory (found on TreesCharlotte's website)? If not, then what are the steps that the UDO and/or the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan will take to work towards making this opportunity a reality? Furthermore, will the required levels of green area credits be tiered for different parts of the city? Given that some areas have been historically excluded from receiving the benefits of tree canopy (e.g., higher home values, slower driving speeds, reduced energy bills), will the development or redevelopment be held to a higher standard in those neighborhoods?
11/12/2021	29.5 Green Area	Open space / tree save is a land government taking on remodel homes and teardowns.
12/16/2021	29.5 Green Area	Just an idea: Could developers be asked to increase their tree save for new residential developments? Or provide new tree plantings for yards after the houses are complete? Restrict the species to native southeastern trees. Nothing invasive, or foreign. It seems like there are many neighborhoods without trees, only houses. Furthermore, a community garden requirement per neighborhood would be beneficial. You could even offer housing assistance program to homeless who maintain the garden part-time. Just some thoughts. thanks for your time & have a happy holiday season.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	29.7 A. 6 is impossible to meet with utilities running parallel with the street. if you mean those running to service the structure, its still hard in Urban zones which is why it was previously exempted & should be now
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	page 29-11 c. removed the allowance to count existing trees as perimeter requirement. Why?
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	#3 b. how to trees plant trees. fix the sentence
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	And why is article 29 the only article that the Administrator doesn't say ' or his assigns'?
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	page 29-12 C. 1. b. it is impossible to have parking spots 40' away from a tree trunk without halving your # of parking spaces
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	page 29-132.b.ii is in error as buses & tractor trailers aren't allowed in Tier 4
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	pg 29-13 SF homes don't have parking lots. how does this apply
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	29.9 C. i find it interesting that THE Chief Urban Forester has no ' assigns' but when it comes to Emergencies "The City' can waive a requirement
11/27/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	Urban Forestry dept inspectors insonsitently treat townhomes as commercial properties. TH are Single-Family attached and are considered One- and Two-Family Units per state law. the inspectors need instruction
12/16/2021	29.7 Tree Planting Requirements	I appreciate the one mention of native tree species. The city should raise the bar by planting 70% native species. Also, how about a bounty on Bradford Pears and other invasive species like they have in the Triangle? For any BP removed, the city provides a native tree? More dogwoods?