

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/11/2021	3.1 Purpose and Applicability	Multifamily is not permitted in CG or CR (commercial place types). While I understand the intent of these two districts to be for auto oriented places in our City, I.e., car dealerships on Independence, apartments already exist on many auto-oriented roads. There should not be a blanket ban of multifamily developments along these roads. They should be considered in some cases.
10/27/2021	3.2 Zoning Districts	WHY DOES THIS FORM NOT PERMIT COMMENTS ON ARTICLE 29 AND BEYOND?!; 29.1: Is there no longer a mechanism for alternative compliance with the tree ordinance? Why remove that flexibility?
12/7/2021	3.2 Zoning Districts	It looks like Place Types and Zoning Districts contain some of the development requirements within the UDO. Will development of a property be governed by Place Type and the a subset of the that place type (the Zoning District)? What is the purpose of the Place Type in the UDO?
10/29/2021	3.2 Zoning Districts; 3.3 Zoning Map	Per section 3.2 "ZONING DISTRICT TRANSLATION" it appears that "CC" Commerical Center Zoning district (along with MX-1, MX-2, and NS) are missing from the table and the rest of the chapter. If they are presumably translating to one of the new districts or relating Placetypes it might be important to add them to avoid confusion or describe their current status.
11/15/2021	3.3 Zoning Map	Is there a proposed land use map or planned zoning for the land just north of Northlake Mall?
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	The definition of + needs to be made here (as well as in the CSM). Plus means median not an additional lane. for example: 4+lane is not clear without that knowledge
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	The statement that a Local street is only Local if it's in a Neighborhood 1 Place type is incorrect and misleading. Remove the N1 limitation.
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	D on page 3-6. The Hierarchy of frontage types is not rational and is confusing. Look at the table note 1 on page 5-7. Needs serious re-thinking to make Frontage Hierarchy work in reality.
10/8/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations; 3.4 Applicability of Frontages	In article 4, part 4.3, section D Point #1: "Building height setback plane" - This seems to be too short of a sidewall height requirement. At 12' and if there is no room for extra setback possible to increase the additional height, asking for a permit seems to be adding on to the permitting process for new construction, leading to longer delays. Most new constructions will need to be 2 floors, and with even the basic 2 floor home, you will need at least 20', even considering if there is no car garage added. Being that the maximum allowable height is 40'-48' dependent on the zoning, I believe this should be revised to a higher sidewall height.
10/11/2021	4.1 Purpose	I am against permitting duplexes and triplexes on any available lot. I live in Dilworth which has taken great care to manage and limit its commercial development and this would undermine the fabric of the community. Stop the madness!
10/20/2021	4.1 Purpose	Overall statement of this section is " Respect the character & Development patterns...of established residential neighborhoods...and reuse of existing neighborhood commercial establishments under prescribed conditions."

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/12/2021	4.1 Purpose	This is just a general comment about the UDO. Though all of these changes will make housing more expensive, I'm confused on why there is no mention or motivation for addressing climate change. Yes, addressing climate change adds even more cost to buildings but the added expenses of this current plan will do nothing to help the planet save for a few trees. As a builder, I was one of the first Energy Star certified builders when I couldn't get a customer to give a hoot. Now, everyone wants an efficient house. So, now we are building in the infrastructure for solar powered roofs. It will not be very long before solar powered NEW houses are common yet there is no incentive in here to bake this in. I understand my point might be viewed to be beyond the UDO's mission but I urge the city to add incentives/breaks for builders to help combat climate change.
12/23/2021	4.1 Purpose	There should be a scorecard which evaluates the suitability of any specific location for affordable housing which looks at aspects such as proximity, income diversity, access and neighborhood change. This would be similar to that adopted by City Council on Jan 16t, 2019 entitled City of Charlotte Affordable Housing Location Guidelines.
10/20/2021	4.1 Purpose	The new UDO reclassified R3, R4, R5, R6 and R8 to N1A, N1B, N1C, N1D, N1 E. Does this reclassification still carry all the requirements in old zone code? For example R3 zone requires the maximum density to be 3 per acre. Under this restriction, we then have all the other criteria such as minimum lot area, lot width, etc. Now in the UDO draft, N1A didn't specify the maximum density per acre. Instead it just states that the minimum lot area is 10000 s.f.. Does this mean the N1A will remove the requirement of maximum density to be 3 per acre?; I also notice that the UDO reclassified RMF12, RMF 17, RMF 22, RMF 43 to N2B. With the old code each one has the maximum units requirement per acre thus all of them are different regarding the density. With the new code of N2B, how can we make the difference? Or we just make all of them to be equal?
11/6/2021	4.1 Purpose	In the current ordinance Single Family Development Section 9.205 there is language, "Density is the first standard." Even if there is enough land to create two conforming lots that are compatible in every respect to the neighborhood you cannot do it unless you have enough gross acreage that is 1/3 acre for R3 Does the new ordinance eliminate this provision: The first test is density.
11/12/2021	4.1 Purpose	Residential Clustering is an important option of the Ordinance, I not not see the Cluster Ordinance in the draft UDO.
1/5/2022	4.1 Purpose; 4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	4.1: I am extremely supportive of the inclusion of 1-3 unit buildings in our residential neighborhoods! However, I do wish that fourplexes were also allowed by right in these same neighborhoods. And as someone who is somewhat familiar with development financing, it's hard to see how a fourplex would ever get built with the requirement of an affordable unit.
10/8/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	*Need clarification on this point* - article 4, part 4.3, section C: Front/Corner side setbacks - Can you confirm if this is truly from the street or from the right-of-way (property line)?
10/20/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Can any non- residential bldg in N-1 be up to 300' long? I'm concerned that does not 'reflect the character'?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/20/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	This article allows the adjustment of setback based on existing structures nearby— how does this affect the Historic District?
11/17/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Limiting duplex height to 12' at the side setback will reduce the number of duplexes that can be built. This will hurt affordability. a two story building is the most cost effective way to build an affordable duplex. ; Am I correct that lots of record will not be grandfathered as it relates to street improvements, SWIM buffers, Post Construction buffers etc? If so this will reduce the affordability of housing .
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Table 3-1: R-8 should convert to something allowing higher density. Currently due to the restrictions of N1-D this would be a MAJOR downgrade to R-8 zoning. On smaller 1/3 acre lots or 1/2 acre lots you can get a 35' tall quadruplex. This new zoning change to N1-D would be devastating to growing neighborhoods that are already sprawling with dense, tall duplexes. This change alone could be devastating to the Charlotte housing market increasing scarcity and increasing costs of housing even further.</p> <p>Maximum in N1 district is a triplex unless you add an affordable unit and its on a thoroughfare. Currently R-8 allows a quadruplex in all locations. R-8 should be converted to something that AT MINIMUM allows the same density it currently does.</p> <p>N1-A through N1-D max height limit for duplexes and triplexes is 12' tall at the side wall. This will be absolutely devastating to development and growth. I personally design many, many 2 story or 3 story duplexes on R-8 lots (future N1-D). 2-3 story duplexes on R-8 property is providing housing in neighborhoods that otherwise would be abandoned by developers. The cost of land is already way too high to simply build a single family home in these neighborhoods. Developers would have to sell a huge single family home unaffordable for the majority of the charlotte population where before with current R-8 zoning they could build a duplex, triplex or quadruplex for a much more affordable cost to future home buyers. The 12' height limit at the side wall is just too low. Most lots are maybe 1/4 acre or smaller and when building a duplex the building is close to the setbacks. The VAST majority of lots will limit the duplexes to 1 story. No developer would waste their time or money on properties like this. THIS WILL KILL the housing market in Charlotte. Trust me. We already cannot build enough housing for how fast Charlotte is growing. If you have to keep the height limit for N1 then at minimum have an exception for currently zoned R-8 properties to allow 40' tall like it currently does. R-8 could change to an N2 district or maybe make some changes to N1-D but this cannot be allowed to remain as is.</p>
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Requirements for private open space should clearly state that it is allowed on a rooftop terrace or patio like the current zoning code does. There are many properties and projects that rely on this to be able to be a developable property.
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The 6 unit maximum for attached housing doesnt make sense. I know the purpose is to not have long expanses of buildings however units can come in all different shapes and sizes. I can have 6 units at 16' wide which will look quite small. Then i can have 6 units at 35' wide which will be more than double the size of the other one. Limiting units just doesnt make sense.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Requiring units to be 1'-5' above sidewalk will cause major issues. There are so many properties where the entrance has to be very close to the sidewalk or it is right beside it. How do you comply with ADA? Nashville Tennessee has the same rule and it caused a HUGE problem with a townhouse project I worked on. It delayed the project a month because the zoning administrator just couldnt understand that ADA laws required a flush entrance. Zoning argued "you can just build a ramp" but there was no room. The entrance was just 1' from the sidewalk and there was literally no room for a ramp. We had to go all the way up the ladder to the boss's boss just to talk common sense and waive the requirement. Its sad that a city zoning code can conflict with federal law.</p>
1/4/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>I'm concerned that the sidewall requirements will greatly limit the ability for people to build duplexes in Charlotte. I was under the impression that the goal of the UDO was more middle/diversity of housing products. The new sidewall agreement actually makes it harder to build duplexes than is currently possible in the R-8 zoning district.</p> <p>It will be nearly impossible to build any duplexes on lots that are only 50 ft wide. There are many 50 ft wide lots in Charlotte that are located near transportation nodes and higher density areas in Charlotte. This is because a 1 story product is very cost prohibitive and a 2 story product could only be 20 ft wide.</p> <p>Unfortunately, a majority of lots with 60' of width in Charlotte currently have larger homes on them. With larger homes the cost to purchase will be driven up to a point where the only duplexes that can be built will be in ultra high end areas.</p> <p>Currently, prices are soaring in Charlotte due to a lack of supply. We have a real opportunity to make a difference in this supply if we address the sidewall requirements. My recommendation would be to adjust the sidewall requirement to 22ft. This will allow for standard 2-story products while preventing 3-story boxes from taking over a neighborhood. This will significantly increase the supply of homes while having a balance within the character of neighborhoods.</p>
	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>4.3: I am concerned that the maximum building coverage % on all lots is too low. If a duplex is to be built on 40% of a lot, it could make said development financially unfeasible. I am extremely supportive of the inclusion of duplexes/triplexes in our neighborhoods, and I fear this may deter them from being developed in some neighborhoods. I also do not understand the need for such maximums at all when the setback rules already exist.</p>
1/6/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Increase maximum height from 48 feet and remove all minimum setbacks. Require all vehicular access be to the rear of the property.</p>
1/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Page 4-3, Item C, Siting—Why is the front setback modified to be less than the current Charlotte Ordinance? It appears the current ordinance requires generally 30' (or 42' from 'local' streets) while the UDO states 27' in a similar situation?</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 4-4, Item D Height- Why is maximum residential base height 48' on N1-A and N1-B when current ordinance is 40' base height? Note that in NB-2A base height max is 40'
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	N1-F is the same thing as N2-A. Why? What is the reason for having 2 identical districts?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Unlabeled table on page 4-2 (dimensional table) points out several problems when combined with unlabeled table on page 4-3

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	(setbacks): if the goal is to increase density then the dimensions and setbacks and coverage ratios need to allow the greater density.
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	the height requirements in N1 C to F should be above 48' not dropped to 40'
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	You can't reach the Building coverage ratio for N1D, E or F because the setbacks are too big. Reduce the side and rear setbacks.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	N1-F for TH has a 13 ft deep building site. You can't build a home 13' deep. Bother the rear and front setbacks are too large
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	The Note 2 on the unlabeled chart on page 4-3 conflicts with the definition of Lot Width pn page 2-20 (drawing on page 2-21) which allows a variance of 30'. 30' variance makes sense, Note 2 does not.
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note 5 on the unlabeled chart on page 4-3 needs to change. Having a greater SIDE setback on a corner when the FRONT faces an arterial has no rationale. if it SIDES to an Arterial, maybe, but likely when it fronts to an arterial it sides to a local & the doubling of a side setback is not important

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Building Height page 4-4. there is no minimum heights listed so it should not say it governs minimum heights
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Definition on page 2-8 changes the current measurement to the structure wall not the setback. (as reflected in Note 3) Setback is the correct place to measure relative to the impact on adjacent uses (which is the purpose of this section)
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Unlabeled table page 4-4: all 40' heights need to be at least 48' and an argument can be made to go higher since density is the objective.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note 1: there is no reason to have setbacks for 'structures integral to the operation' of the structure setback the distance equal to the height. And since we are talking ABOUT N1, then are you not saying all setbacks are equal to the height. Clearly the wording is wrong and needs a change
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	D 1 a. page 4-4 restricts duplexes to single story (12' side wall)except is a "SURVEY" is given at permitting. A survey shows horizontal improvements and would not show height. What do you propose to do with said "Survey" . To get a 2-story duplex/ tri-plex you'd have to have side setbacks of 5' plus 12' = 17'. What greater good is achieved by wasting that much of the lot (aka lowering density)?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Building articulation requirements on N1-F can not be applied to TH as such aesthetic requirements are prohibited by § 160D-702. TH's, Duplexes & tri-plexes in NC Building Code are 'A Single-Family dwelling unit constructed in groups of three or more attached units separated by property line in which each unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides' & can have no regulation in Section E or F on page 4-6;

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	section G mandating garage location and Primary Pedestrian entry AND Section H (Building Design Standards) are aesthetic requirements and are prohibited by § 160D-702. TH's, Duplexes & tri-plexes in NC Building Code are 'A Single-Family dwelling unit constructed in groups of three or more attached units separated by property line in which each unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides'
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Limiting the # of units in a row of One- & Two Family dwellings is a violation of § 160D-702. ; In addition to violating § 160D-702, the mandating of foundation heights is an ADA violations. Homes need to be able to meet wheelchair accessibility if the customer so chooses; in section 4.4 - there is not enough clarity to figure out how Open Space conflicts or overlaps with Green Area. And there is Zero clarity on how it will be applied to all expansions of buildings. And since Open Space is not required for Single family detached the section 4.5 A (conservation Residential) has no reason for being written)
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4.5A is not needed since there is no required Open Space in N1A to N1D.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Assuming there is some clarity you could add that makes this section usable the following also need changes: the setbacks need some variability from the base requirements on page 4-3
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	the Voluntary Mixed-Income Development still has provisions that will make it unable to achieve the Mixed-Income Objective. Changes needed: The 50% + Affordable Units is too high (3 a & 3 c). that number needs to be 20%.
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4D- the required 'dispersion' of units can not be done when you have only 1 or 2 affordable units.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4e - requiring that the product type not be altered for the Affordable Units isn't how the real world works. Adding Townhouses/ Duplex would naturally be affordable relative to the Single Family detached. & you can't disperse a TH or Duplex..... so conflicts with item D again
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	On-site pedestrian connectivity in Section 16.5 can not require the lead walk to homes be a certain standard as it is an aesthetic requirements and are prohibited by § 160D-702.
11/12/2021	4.4 Open Space Requirements	Open space is good, but not all open space is good. To make a blanket requirement all development should have open space is a taking of land by government. This type of taking also make Affordable/Market Rate Houses more unattainable. Example, R-3 land is zoned for 3 houses per acre. The additional open space/tree save actually lowers the density down to about 2.25 DUA.
12/13/2021	4.5 Alternative Development Options	In 4.5 section B (Voluntary Mixed-Income Residential Development), part 3(a) stipulates that the period of affordability for rental properties is 15 years. I believe that a longer period of affordability, perhaps 30 years or even longer, would better protect the mixed-income nature of the residential development in this section and preserve affordable housing in Charlotte.
10/14/2021	4.7 General Development Standards	Can existing Single family Homes in Home Owner Association areas be converted under the new UDO? Will the new UDO rules override existing Home Owner Association rules? Or will HOA's have the ability to prevent duplex conversions? Also for some reason I cannot search the UDO documents for key phrases. Perhaps the document can be released so keywords can be searched in it?; will the UDO allow a deed restricted single family home in a single family Home Owners Association to be converted to a duplex? Or do the HOA's bylaws override the UDO's authority?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/15/2021	4.7 General Development Standards	<p>The current draft does not allow for ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) to be built on lots with duplexes (existing or new) as the principle structure. I believe this to be inconsistent with the desired goals of the City for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordable Housing – Allowing ADU's to be added to existing duplexes would enable hundreds of current older NOAH units (of which I own two) to potentially add a third rental unit to the property. This would encourage owners of these affordable units to resist the offers to tear them down for newer, more expensive housing. The City wants to keep as many NOAH units as possible and this would be a logical incentive, consistent with that objective. Otherwise, it puts tremendous economic pressure on these owners to sell the properties to builders and developers as tear downs. 2. Logical Consistency – The current draft would enable owners to tear down the existing structure and build a triplex in its place but it won't allow a third unit to be added to the current duplex. That seems illogical. If an attached ADU was added to an existing duplex (or built unattached) it would look similar to a triplex, yet would probably have cheaper rents on the two older units because newer units cost more. 3. Increased Density – Increasing the density in older neighborhoods enables the City to provide services at reduced costs per person. By adding these smaller units throughout the community that objective is accomplished without encountering the typical resistance toward new development. 4. Housing Variety within Communities – enabling ADU's to be built on lots with duplexes, increases the variety of housing types available within a community. Typically, the ADU's are small and appeal to single people (both younger and much older) not interested in apartment living for any number of reasons. This demographic has trouble finding housing currently as the supply is very limited. Mixing this type of housing in neighborhoods with larger housing provides a welcome mix. <p>Also, I would appreciate feedback on how the staff views this suggestion. Should they opt not to include this provision I would like to hear the reasons against it, so I better understand the thought process. If there are practical reasons for excluding this option, that I am overlooking, I would appreciate knowing what they are. Thanks.</p>
10/11/2021	5.1 Purpose	I am against building duplexes and triplexes on any available lot. I live in a Dilworth where we have carefully managed development. Please stop the madness!
1/5/2022	5.1 Purpose	5.1: I love the density that is being sought in N2-A/B/C! More -plex buildings and apartments distributed throughout our neighborhoods and not just on crowded, loud arterials is great for renters and lower-income people!
12/19/2021	5.2 Uses	Current R-8 zoning should be bumped up to N2 district. It is a HUGE mistake leaving R-8 as an N1 district with its current restrictions.
10/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	If the goal of allowing commercial uses in a neighborhood district is to support the notion of a 15-minute city, why is the minimum lot size for a commercial use so big? A 12,000sf lot with a minimum width of 50'-80' is not a "corner store"
11/11/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	I know that height limits will be based on zoning but are the 48' height limits for multifamily buildings in N2-B stop at 4 stories (assuming each story is 12') and what about multifamily over a commercial use? It seems that the 48' limit might force flat roofs especially if a developer wants to go the maximum height. How will roofs play into the height limit?
12/13/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	In section 5.3 section A part 3, I am skeptical as to why public paths, public parks, and transit stations are not considered frontages for N2-A and N2-B districts. Shouldn't development orient itself toward these uses as frontages in order to encourage development that is friendly to pedestrians, transit, and green space?
1/11/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 5-5- Chart should be modified to show 40' maximum for Row B, N2-A and N2-B— subject to 'Note 4K'— which then allows a height bonus increase to 65' within 200 feet.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 5-5 'Note 3' - " contiguous area of two or fewer parcels..." The word 'contiguous' needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section C & C continue to indicate that the Staff is not aware that state law classifies ANY housing unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides as a One- and Two-Family Dwelling. The UDO may not impose requirements not allowed by Law on One- and Two-Family dwellings whether part of a mixture of dwelling types or Not
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	5.2 B - what is the rationale for 2/3 maximum unit type?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section D page 5-5 says it's minimum and maximum heights but no minimum is listed. change the language

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	in the unlabeled table on that page you again reference the FAA regs. (see page 4-4) it would be simpler to add this note ONLY in districts that actually have a possibility of getting over 200'
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section E page 5-6 - the maximum building length is too short. Explain the reasoning for such a limitation
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section E (articulation) pg 5-6 through 5-8 contain Building Design Elements that are not legal on all allowed uses in N2-A, B, & C. Housing Units regulated by the North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings can NOT have regulations on Building Articulations (especially footnote 3).
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note on Transparency section F is the only time UDO correctly excepts townhouses.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Item G page 5-10 can not regulate building length on Townhomes as they are regulated by North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings.
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	page 5-11: Building design Standards for entrances, grade heights, sidewalk width to the entrances, facade variations, architectural features all violate § 160D-702 when the product is a townhome (Roof & foundation connected on no more then 2 sides)
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	page 5-13 section I (Building Material Restrictions) can not be applied to triplexes, quads etc regardless of if they are on sub-lots. § 160D-702 does not differentiate based on how you plat it.
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	pg 5-13 Except for trying to raise the cost of structures what would be a legitimate reason to regulate exterior building materials

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	section 5.4- please explain how you intend to regulate the addition of Open Space for a change of use or expansion?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	For new Development what is Open Space if not Green Area / Tree Save?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	The requirements for sidewalk onsite aesthetics (width) are not legal when applied to Townhomes, Duplex, Quads & triplex per § 160D-702
10/27/2021	6.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	In Section E (Building Articulation), exceptions should be built in for historic/existing buildings. As written, the section makes every large, long commercial building non-conforming... and means you can't improve those, because it "worsens" the non-conformance.
1/11/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Page 7-5- 'Note 3' provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.</p> <p>Note should be changed to read " The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40' limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined—see “ contiguous area of two or fewer parcels...” The word ‘contiguous’ needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.
10/27/2021	9.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Innovation and Mixed-Use Districts should allow greater density than shown here. See, for example, the Innovation District in Winston-Salem that council just visited.
1/11/2022	10.1 Purpose	(As described in the 2040 Plan this should be the ‘heart’ of the 10 minute neighborhood— but the UDO requirements do not fit a number of very well defined and thriving “ Neighborhood centers” in existing parts of the community)
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row A- a minimum height requirement makes many existing buildings ‘non- conforming’- yet those non- conforming buildings define this heart of the neighborhood. Why a minimum?
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row B- as written, this makes NB-1 properties behind Neighborhood Centers see a huge increase allowed over current ordinance height.
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	‘Note 3’ provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Note should be changed to read “ The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40’ limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined—see “ contiguous area of two or fewer parcels...” The word ‘contiguous’ needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.
1/12/2022	11.1 Purpose	Article 11 - Community Activity Center for PID 17513103 makes no sense. Should be Neighborhood 1 or 2
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row B- as written, this makes NB-1 properties behind Community Activity Centers see a huge increase allowed over current ordinance height.
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	‘Note 3’ provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Note should be changed to read “ The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40’ limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined---see "contiguous area of two or fewer parcels..." The word 'contiguous' needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.
12/9/2021	12.6 General Development Standards	It says that the max height is 65' if within "200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 Place Type". My house backs up to a property that would be RAC under the proposed UDO. And despite being a single family home, it would be zoned NAC under the proposed UDO. Does that mean that my house (because its not a Neighborhood 1 zoning) could have a 250' tower literally in my back yard or would any development be limited to 65'? The wording isn't entirely clear but any person with a brain could realize a 250' abutting single family is unimaginable...to say the least.
1/6/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	In order to have more tools in the toolbox we need another district type, similar to Raleigh's Streetside Historic District. This tool could be used in NoDa and other neighborhoods where preserving the street character is important and so is flexibility. Think of the Johnston YMCA or all the buildings on Davidson Street that are houses and also now restaurants and businesses. Several are currently protected piecemeal through rezoning, but a district would preserve the entire character of the 1900 mill village. https://raleighnc.gov/business/content/PlanDev/Articles/Zoning/CharacterPreservationOverlayDistricts.html
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	This section should be modified to provide greater protection and definition for the historic districts adopted by City Council.
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	The thinking in the UDO is that the HDC overlay will govern. While legally that is true, the Place Types overwhelm, with pressure of development, the HDC volunteer review that is established. The question for City Council in adopting the UDO is do we want historic districts and their controls, or not?? As currently written the UDO as a whole will destroy the historic districts and their character.
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	Short of adding a section to every Place Type protecting the historic district, a 40 foot maximum base height in or abutting a historic district boundary should be the minimum change adopted.
11/4/2021	14.5 MHP Manufactured Home Park Zoning District	On a property zoned RMH (residential mobile home) it should be modified to include the ability to live in a travel trailer. A travel trailer is a mobile home.