

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/12/2021	Global Comment	Affordable/Market rate homes cannot be built with all the governmental regulations!; Remodel homes and teardown should be exempt from this nonsense. Private Property Rights	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal.	No
12/8/2021	Global Comment	A 3-month interim period between planned adoption and when the UDO takes effect: Three months is extremely inadequate timing for both staff and the public to become acclimated to a new development and zoning ordinance. When you consider the trickledown effect that the UDO will have on all aspects of city business (fiscal, housing and neighborhood development, legal), three months is insufficient timing for all associated pieces to come together. And, there will be newly elected city councilmembers who will have to have to digest all of this. Please reconsider a more appropriate timeframe for this brand-new ordinance to take effect. I highly suggest one year from adoption as the effective date.	The effective date of any potentially adopted UDO is still under review.	TBD
1/5/2022	Global Comment	Charlotte's current land use and growth patterns are unsustainable. I see the changes proposed in the UDO as critical for maintaining Charlotte's future as a vibrant and growing community. As such getting the UDO passed in a form that increases densities and reduces auto dependence as much as possible will be one of the most important things Charlotte can do.	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal.	No
12/9/2021	Global Comment	this website is not very good. just want to comment on RAC	Please contact UDO staff if you continue to have difficulties entering your comments on RAC.	No
12/15/2021	Global Comment	If you own your property, the city shouldn't tell me how to pay for my mortgage.	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/10/2022	Global Comment	<p>(Part 1 of 2) We propose an addition to the UDO of an overlay district to areas of medium to high housing precarity risk (these are the areas that are reflected in pale orange, red, and dark red on the map) utilizing UC Berkeley’s Housing Precarity Risk model and applying it within the Charlotte city limits and all of the unincorporated areas that are within Charlotte’s “sphere of influence.” Any development built within this overlay district would “trigger” a community benefits table and developers would be required to choose whether or not to meet the point system of the community benefits table or go through a standard rezoning process. This process mirrors the decision map of Asheville’s hotel development overlay district.</p> <p>This is why we propose that any project receiving public assistance (which includes tax increment grants, public land sales, as well as directly funding development projects through public dollars) should be subject to a community benefits table process. This is to ensure that the City leverages public dollars to the full extent of their usefulness and provides maximum benefits to the communities in which development projects receiving public assistance occur.</p>	<p>Updated 03/12/22: The UDO Team is awaiting the results of the Community Benefits Task Force work to determine potential updates to the UDO. Changes to the UDO will be based on the results of that process.</p>	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/10/2022	Global Comment	<p>(Part 2 of 2) We also understand that given the CATS light rail's use as an economic development driver in Charlotte, it is necessary to consider the impact of public investment in light rail transit as a driver of gentrification. It is this direct public investment with indirect consequences that we also consider public assistance to development. In addition to the above, we propose that projects developing within a mile radius on either side of a light rail station be subject to the community benefits process.</p> <p>We propose to set a threshold on the scale of certain projects that fall outside of the purview of the Community Benefits Overlay District and Public Assistance sections so that large scale developments that will have sizable impacts in their areas must also adhere to a community benefits process.</p>	Updated 03/12/22: See response above.	TBD
1/13/2022	Global Comment	What is the point of soliciting these comments? Similar to Area Plans of the past, Charlotte will continue to ignore the standards at the will of developers, even in the face of overwhelming protest from area residents.	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal. Each ordinance specific comment is being considered by the UDO team.	No
1/13/2022	Global Comment	1. having definitions in 6 sections, when only one Article is titled Definitions is confusing. merge ALL definitions in Article 2	A select few articles of the UDO have article-specific definitions that apply only to that article. As such, those definitions are held separately from the general definitions. Staff will add a sentence to Article 2 to clarify this approach.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/13/2022	Global Comment	2. Applicability & triggers for requirements not consistent throughout the UDO. Should be made consistent. for example: 'New construction', 'expansion', 'expansion of a certain size', 'any building permit', 'any driveway permit'. Provide a chart of triggers so you can see how complex it is as written now	The UDO team and consultants are reexamining current proposed language for opportunities to provide additional clarity and consistency for applicability and triggers in the next draft UDO. When reasonable, changes will be make to create consistency.	Yes
1/13/2022	Global Comment	3 The Administration and Enforcement Articles do not flow together. Variances, appeals, and Enforcement need to be rewritten. this is a time it might work better to go back to Drainage enforcement inside the drainage article (for example)	For variances, appeals, and enforcement their are some common requirements. Certain specific development areas have additional requirements for variances, appeals, and enforcement. The organization of these articles is designed to address both the common and additional requirements in a singular location and avoid duplication.	No
1/13/2022	Global Comment	4. One purpose of a UDO is to streamline the process but it appears that this first draft ignored that goal. The 'undisturbed natural area' was rightly eliminated because 'Green Area' would apply, but there is still SWIM Buffers and PCSO buffers - these should be combined or one eliminated. There is still Landscape/ Screening but it isn't combined with Tree Protection, or 'Green Area' or 'Open Space' or 'Internal Plantings'. All requirements for what counts as Open Space, Green Area etc should all be uniform & include flood plain, buffers, steep slopes, power easements & environmentally sensitive areas.	TUpdated 4/25/22: These standards are designed to meet different objectives and combining them is not feasible. However, opportunities for overlap will be identified in the next UDO draft.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/13/2022	Global Comment	5. with 2040 Vision Goals to increase density, and facilitate a variety of middle-income housing types throughout the city it's shocking the UDO hinders not supports the Goals. Examples of what needs to be vetted relative to the harm it causes the greater 2040 goal: 15% green area + 5-10% open Space + 5-10% internal plantings, widened Stormwater easements, big setbacks, wider roads, smaller lots in some N1 & N2 but setbacks constrain building site sizes so lots have to be greater than minimum to physically build a dwelling, buffer yards in addition to setbacks along certain road classifications, Max side wall heights for duplexes/ triplexes, heights for ADU not exceed principal home & <50% of size, Max building length and heights. Building coverage constraints no longer necessary - other items affect massing. For infill locations to increase middle-income housing the hurdles include , among other things, required tree surveys, as-built and tree permits for existing homes; citizen stormwater plan and permit, root zone impact restrictions.	Updated 03/12/22: Thank you for your comment. Most of the items referenced are being assessed through the Economic Analysis for the UDO. If there are specific recommendations for changes to the UDO, we request that those be submitted.	No
1/13/2022	Global Comment	6. Vesting is a right afforded by state law and can not be removed by a change of applicability date - as it appears to be the intent in Articles 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30; nor by just (falsely) stating your valid permit expires even if you start work.	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 04/25/22: The vested rights standards in Article 38.6 will be updated and reviewed by the City Attorney's Office to ensure compliance with state law.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/8/2022	Global Comment	I do not agree with the proposed restrictions regarding short term rentals.	<p>Updated 03/23/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining the conditions for short-term rentals for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Staff has heard and received, and continues to hear and receive, a tremendous amount of feedback on the topic of short-term rentals. Perspectives have spanned the spectrum generating both positive and negative comments about the proposed standards. Numerous benefits and drawbacks have been identified.</p> <p>A topic of this significance warrants additional discussion and consideration beyond staff. Staff held two listening sessions on February 24, 2022. Staff has also presented takeaways from short-term rental comments to City Council and has heard Council’s initial feedback on the topic.</p> <p>Staff will work with the UDO consultant to update the proposed standards and updated standards will be included in the second draft of the UDO to be released in May.</p> <p>Updated 04/27/2022: Please see the short-term rental regulations update posted on the UDO website at http://charlotteudo.org.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/19/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 1 of 2) Article 25 (Post Construction Stormwater) Article 28 (Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control) Article 29 (Tree Protection)</p> <p>The Mecklenburg County Soil and Water Conservation District would like to propose a concept we are referring to as "Stormwater Pond Amenitization."</p> <p>We propose wording that could nudge/ encourage developers to build multi-beneficial facilities that help in managing stormwater while also creating usable greenspace.</p> <p>The more urbanized areas of Charlotte that are experiencing rapid development are losing park, greenspace, and tree covered areas to parking decks, housing, and commercial/ retail space. At the same time, efforts are continuously underway to still have usable facilities for pedestrian and outdoor recreation. The UDO has significant verbiage around still protecting water quality in the face of additional stormwater runoff, which is good. Along those lines, the UDO has an excellent opportunity to use stormwater provisions to further promote the establishment of outdoor space.</p>	<p>Updated 04/14/22: Thank you for your comment. Staff will assess opportunities to encourage amenitized SCMs in the next update to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg BMP Design Manual. Staff will also add language to the UDO to clarify how amenities like these can overlap tree, stormwater and open space requirements to encourage these sorts of amenitized natural areas.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/19/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 2 of 2) Wet ponds don't have to just be holes in the ground that slowly release water. Wetponds and other Best Management Practices (BMPs) can be neighborhood amenities in addition to beneficial water features. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the Sedgfield Neighborhood. The main park in this neighborhood was originally designed as a flow moderation BMP for Dairy Branch. This space was double purposed as a park, and it sees heavy use from the neighborhoods surrounding it. More recently, the stormwater pond for the future Marsh development was built as an amenity with lighting, benches, and aesthetic improvements to benefit the neighborhood. These two examples provide a blueprint for what a space could look like that protects our watersheds while still providing outdoor recreation areas. We propose wording in support of this concept that could nudge and reward developers who choose to implement multi-beneficial facilities such as this.</p> <p>-- Mecklenburg Soil and Water Conservation District, Board of Supervisors</p>	Updated 04/14/22: See comment above.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/2/2022	1.3 Purpose and Intent; 1.6 Relationship to Other Regulations	<p>In its current form the UDO will make it more difficult to deliver affordable housing and drive it out of infill locations creating sprawl. There are many lots recorded before 1992 that are currently grandfathered and exempt from SWIM Buffers and Post Construction Buffers. Some of these lots will be made worthless. It seems like this will generate a lot of lawsuits and controversy as people become aware of this.</p> <p>The Driveway and Access Rules have not received the same amount of public scrutiny and need comment as the main body of the UDO and there is a lot in there need detailed attention. not enough consideration is give to topography.</p> <p>The height restriction at the side setback will make it very difficult (maybe impossible) to build reasonable duplexes and triplexes on lots that are currently R-8, R-5 and R-4 . Maybe this could limit them to 2 storys instead; The Driveway and Access Rules are closed for comment on January 31.</p>	<p>Updated 04/28/2022: SWIM and Post Constuction Stormwater standards will continue to exempt those lots developed prior to the adoption of the original ordinaces subject to the dates specified in the applicability sections of these articles.</p> <p>The Driveway and Access Rules will be incorporated as part of the new Charlotte Streets Manual. The Charlotte Streets Manual is referenced in the UDO but is not part of the UDO. The public engagement and feedback process for the Charlotte Streets Manual is being coordinated by the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT).</p> <p>The height restriction for sidewalls will be increased in the second draft UDO from 12' to 20'</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/27/2022	Global Comment	<p>Parks. The plan lacks planning for parks. As the city has grown our parks (already way too small) have been forgotten. In high growth areas like the South End which has been attracting large numbers of people, no addition of park space has been planned.</p> <p>Please add requirements for developers to put funds into city parks and please encourage the city to purchase properties to build and expand parks for all for now and into the future.</p> <p>Access to outdoor space in the city is critical for a healthy city and for attracting future growth.</p>	<p>Updated 03/12/22: The UDO includes requirements for usable open space. Parks planning and construction is handled by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation and does not fall under the UDO. However, UDO staff have been and will continue to work with Mecklenburg County to see how the UDO can support the expansion of our park system.</p>	TBD
3/3/2022	Global Comment	<p>We have 1.7 acres of land in west corridor. I traveled to Dubai in 10/21 and saw some of the most beautiful architectural Features - desired aesthetics – creativity & innovative facilities and housing units that we are interested in developing and using some of the aesthetics in an already commercial mix use zoning area. With the green premise growing in popularity across the globe more and more people are turning to recycling shipping containers as a way to reduce the extremely high surplus of empty shipping containers that are just waiting to become a home, office, apartment, school, dormitory, studio, emergency shelter, or anything else.</p> <p>The conversion of shipping containers to living spaces is not a new concept. Shipping containers have become a more common architectural tool over the past few years. Through clippings, insertion of external elements, coatings, and equipment. The container is adopted according to its future use and desired aesthetics. I was wondering if we can put this in our UDO Architectural Feature section?</p>	<p>Updated 4/25/22: Allowances for use of shipping containers will be input into the next draft UDO.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/9/2022	Global Comment	(Part 1 of 2) I would like to address enforcement of the UDO, once adopted. Neighbors should not have to be enforcers of the ordinance. If a builder builds too close to a property line, or violates a setback rule, for example, it should not be up to the neighbors to enforce it. The City, or County, should include enforcement in its operations. Further, if there is a violation, the builder should understand that he will have to take it down and start again, within the parameters of the Ordinance. If it is not enforced, builders will choose to pay a fine rather than comply with the Ordinance.	Updated 03/12/22: Enforcement procedures are outlined in the Administration articles of the UDO. Inspection of projects occurs prior to completion of a project to ensure compliance with regulations. Additional enforcement also occurs after construction for identified violations.	No
3/9/2022	Global Comment	(Part 2 of 2) Second, overall, I think that huge houses on average size lots should be discouraged. Permeable area should be encouraged in order to mitigate flooding and maintain the tree canopy.	Updated 03/12/22: The UDO contains standards to address the scale of housing and well as maximum building coverage for Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts. The Stormwater and Natural Resources Articles also address drainage and tree canopy.	No
3/11/2022	Global Comment	The UDO Draft 1 has significant requirements for the location of entry points & the elevation of the surrounding structure/ grade. Look to table 16-1 for examples. How does the City intend to require compliance – for itself and others- with federal ADA regulations with these restrictions/ requirements?	Updated 04/17/21: The next draft of the UDO will make changes related to the entrance elevations that will address the issue identified. Spacing of prominent entrances, however, will remain.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/11/2022	Global Comment	<p>The overlapping and sometimes not overlapping requirements for Open Space, Tree Space, Green Area and Landscape yards are just too confusing. These requirements should be simplified. Could you please produce a table that shows what counts as each of those requirements.</p> <p>These overlapping requirements appears to adversely affect smaller parcels. Please consider changes to the overlapping requirements that would promote and not dissuade backfill of small parcels that help with 10-min neighborhood goals</p>	Updated 04/11/2022: The next draft of the UDO will make several changes to allow some overlap of these requirements.	Yes
3/12/2022	Global Comments	I find it difficult to comment on various zoning districts without knowing how the Place Types will be finally assigned. The current Policy Map draft has Commercial, Campus, & M&L Place types covering similar facilities. The Policy Map also has Places of Worship in a variety of Place Types (N-1, N-2, Campus, Commercial) so it is hard to postulate how the UDO will structure zoning districts and uses to ensure equity in these institutions.	Updated 04/17/22: In the future, City staff will initiate a process to align zoning with the adopted Policy Map. For many properties that zoning alignment will occur after the Community Area Planning process is completed for the area in which the property is located.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/15/2022	Global Comments	<p>I am Board Chair for "PivotPoint Transitional Housing". We are a start-up, non-profit organization in CLT trying to create a low-barrier, emergency shelter program that serves the needs of the HOMELESS COMMUNITY. Our plan is to provide mobile, mini, single-occupancy shelters for the homeless population in LEGAL ENCAMPMENTS or HOMELESS CAMPGROUNDS. The CURRENT zoning does not allow for our concept. We ask that the zoning around homelessness shelters and transitional housing and where they can be located be BROADENED to allow various "villages, encampments, campgrounds" as well as various "shelters", both fixed, palletized, or MOBILE (on trailer beds). We ask that zoning make room in the UDO for creativity in dealing with the homeless population, specifically. The Homeless population has been ignored and written OUT of Zoning Ordinances all over the country and has prevented solutions in many cities. However, other major cities all over the country are creating new zoning opportunities for non-profits to come in with strategic and creative solutions. With the 2025 Charlotte-Mecklenburg - Housing & Homeless Strategy and focus on the need to address Homelessness in Charlotte, our ask and plea is to have a more favorable reading within the UDO for our concept. We have many people to serve and have great ideas, we just need a path forward. Thank you so much for your consideration on this matter.</p>	<p>Updated 05/03/2022: Staff believes the challenges of the proposed option to provide emergency shelters via "mobile, mini, single-occupancy shelters" is not zoning or land development ordinance-related but that, as described, such shelters do not meet North Carolina code as habitable dwellings.</p> <p>Additionally, campgrounds are a use permitted in the proposed UDO in certain zoning districts with a conditional plan.</p> <p>To discuss in greater detail the challenges of these structures and North Carolina code it is recommended you follow-up with the Building Code Administration staff at the Mecklenburg County Land Use and Environmental Services Agency (LUESA).</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/17/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 1 of 3) The Charlotte Regional Business Alliance® is the voice of business and the only regional economic development organization that grows the economy, advocates for business, and convenes diverse stakeholders for the Charlotte region.</p> <p>A strong business climate is a key objective for the CLT Alliance. We support and promote a commonsense regulatory environment and pro-business policies that help attract, grow, and retain businesses in the region. In considering the proposed Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the City of Charlotte, the revised ordinances should be advanced with an underlying objective of balancing the interests of all stakeholders, as well as future generations of Charlotteans.</p> <p>Key themes viewed by the CLT Alliance as important in the implementation of the UDO include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Business Growth: The UDO should eliminate barriers to entry for businesses that want to grow in Charlotte and those businesses that want to relocate here. 	Thank you for your comment.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/17/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 2 of 3) •Inclusivity: Increased affordable and workforce housing stock is needed to help accommodate some of the rapid population growth in Charlotte. Affordable and workforce housing incentives should be available throughout the city, in every zoning district. Bonuses for affordable and workforce housing could be increased to further promote building such projects.</p> <p>•Future Opportunity: Project details like minimum building heights, block lengths, and maximum building coverage should be evaluated to allow for maximum flexibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oMinimum building height sections should be more flexible, taking into account building square footage so as to not restrict unique, small-scale developments. oBlock length restrictions in industrial areas should be more flexible. Many times, industrial developments can be significant in size. Allowing large-scale industrial developments will allow the city to continue to compete for significant projects. Currently, manufacturing and logistics place types allow for 1,500 feet block lengths. Larger block lengths should be considered in this place type to accommodate significant potential projects. oMaximum building coverage limits what percentage of a lot can be built upon. Other parts of the UDO will inform how large building projects can be. Adding a maximum building coverage element to design adds significant time and cost, stifling development. 	<p>Updated 4/25/22: The draft UDO includes bonuses for affordable housing. Minimum building heights will be revised for the NC district in the next draft, and will consider square footage for all districts. Block lengths for M&L districts will be increased. Maximum building coverage will be increased for some of the N1 districts.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/17/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 3 of 3) •Flexibility and Transparency: Regular review of the UDO should be undertaken by City Council, the Planning Commission, and the public. The UDO amendment process seems fair, and leaders should be open to modifying the UDO to accommodate changes needed for all stakeholders. For example, many projects are required to have 15% green area. This policy could change based on density goals that evolve over time. The UDO should be a guide that can be relied on by all stakeholders, but changes should be able to be made through a reasonable process when needed.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the UDO. We recognize this is a first draft, and public comments will be reviewed and edits will be made to the document. We look forward to continuing to work with all stakeholders to support a final product that helps all of Charlotte thrive.</p>	Updated 04/25/22: Staff is committed to making changes to the UDO as to respond to policy and market changes, and to address unintended consequences.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>The City has designated several Historic Districts. If you are serious about preserving them, the UDO will need to include an overlay for Historic Districts to prevent historic structures from being torn down and replaced. Our Historic Districts already meet the density requirements the city is trying to achieve with new N1 zoning. In addition, a consultant's mapping — presented AFTER the new place types were approved — shows that areas that include Historic Districts are the neighborhoods most likely to be redeveloped, but with market rate, not affordable, housing. Compromising our Historic Districts does nothing to achieve the goals of affordable housing or 10-minute neighborhoods.</p> <p>Please amend the UDO to protect our Historic Districts and our tree canopy. Thank you.</p>	Updated 04/17/22: The current ordinance and the UDO include a Historic Districts Overlay which protects historic structures from being torn down to the extent allowed by state law.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>Greetings! I attended a session focused on Short Term Rentals. Thank you for hosting the session.</p> <p>It was not clear in the session how existing uses would be managed. The ordinance does cover non conforming uses with parameters on how to continue use that was lawful before any changes. Can you confirm this would be applicable to existing short term rentals? I live next to a residential lot that benefits from this same non-conformity section of the ordinance allowing for continued commercial use without further requirements beyond that portion of the ordinance so my assumption was uniform treatment. To ensure no disconnect in communication, I wanted to write in and request for confirmation of the same for an existing short term rental use. Thank you, in advance, for your response.</p>	<p>Updated 03/23/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining the conditions for short-term rentals for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Staff has heard and received, and continues to hear and receive, a tremendous amount of feedback on the topic of short-term rentals. Perspectives have spanned the spectrum generating both positive and negative comments about the proposed standards. Numerous benefits and drawbacks have been identified.</p> <p>A topic of this significance warrants additional discussion and consideration beyond staff. Staff held two listening sessions on February 24, 2022. Staff has also presented takeaways from short-term rental comments to City Council and has heard Council's initial feedback on the topic.</p> <p>Staff will work with the UDO consultant to update the proposed standards and updated standards will be included in the second draft of the UDO to be released in May.</p> <p>Updated 04/27/2022: Please see the short-term rental regulations update posted on the UDO website at http://charlotteudo.org.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 1 of 5) The Charlotte Mecklenburg Climate Leaders has the following comments regarding the UDO, referring to Part IX Stormwater & Natural Resources, Article 29: Tree Protection. Comments regarding Part VIII. General Development Zoning Standards, Article 19: Off-Street Vehicle & Bicycle Parking are also included. Thanks to the staff for their hard work over the past few years in updating this important document.</p> <p>Article 29: Tree Protection - Section 3: MAINTENANCE and PROTECTION OF TREES</p> <p>We are pleased that the UDO removes the exemption within the uptown area and transit station areas from tree save requirements.</p> <p>The requirement in the UDO that all sites save 15% of development for green areas is an improvement from the previous lower requirement. However, given our tree canopy needs, we recommend that all multi-unit developments of a significant size in specifically designated areas of the City be required to provide an additional 10% save for land for parks and greenways where additional trees can be planted.</p>	<p>04/11/22: The current draft UDO has several improvements that will lead to more area on site for green space and open space. This includes a 5% increase in tree save for residential subdivisions. The draft UDO also includes reservation for parks and greenways.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Par 2 of 5) The UDO plan to expand protected trees to include heritage trees on private property is valuable, but we would like to see the size of the trees included to start at 20 dbh (versus the proposed 30 dbh) since 20 dbh trees are considered to be large trees.</p> <p>Article 29: Tree Protection - Section 6: FRONTAGE TREE PLANTING REQUIREMENT</p> <p>The frontage tree planting requirement is a good step. However, the distance of 40' should be shorter for small and medium trees. Small and medium trees need a shorter distance in order to achieve the shade needed to improve the walkability of sidewalks.</p> <p>Article 29: Tree Protection - Section 7: TREE PLANTING REQUIREMENT</p> <p>We would like to see that at least 75% of new required trees shall be native species (versus the proposed 50%) since native trees are more beneficial for wildlife, particularly birds and insects.</p> <p>The current tree ordinance states that payment in lieu (for opting not to provide tree save) will not exceed 90% of the average tax value for an acre of land.</p>	<p>Updated 04/11/22: Staff has heard and received, and continues to hear and receive, a tremendous amount of feedback on the topic of heritage trees. Perspectives have spanned the spectrum generating both positive and negative comments about the draft standards. Numerous benefits and drawbacks have been identified.</p> <p>A topic of this significance warrants additional discussion and consideration beyond staff. Staff held two listening sessions on February 17. Staff has also presented takeaways from heritage tree comments to City Council and has heard their Council's initial feedback on the topic.</p> <p>Staff will work with the UDO consultant to update the draft proposed standards and the updated standards will be included in the second draft of the UDO to be published released in May.</p> <p>The frontage tree planting requirement will be updated to reflect this recommendation. One small maturing tree will be required for every 30 ft of lot frontage. We will consider the recommendation for greater native species as a requirement for tree planting.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 3 of 5) Given the strong need for additional funds to protect our tree canopy, we recommend that this be increased to 100% of the average tax value.</p> <p>The UDO does not adequately address the issue of trees planted in parking lots. We recommend that the pervious area around these trees be increased to support the growth of larger trees with broader canopies which will help reduce the heat build up in parking lots. If some medium sized trees are used, the 40' distance from parking spots should be reduced to 30' to add more shade.</p> <p>Article 29: Tree Protection - Section 8: TREE MITIGATION FUNDS</p> <p>We support the plan to establish a Tree Conservation Fund to directly fund the City's Tree Canopy Preservation Program. However, we recommend that this be named the "Tree Conservation & Equity Fund," in recognition of the need to prioritize funding for trees in low income areas with the least tree coverage. (As noted in the City's Tree Canopy Action Plan, the tree canopy in Charlotte is not equitably distributed.) We also support the plans to establish a Street Tree Planting Fund and a Canopy Care Fund.</p>	<p>Updated 04/11/22: Although we are not looking at any changes to the payment-in-lieu formula, we are changing the capped value for this fee from \$80,100 to \$192,626.</p> <p>The UDO staff will not be increasing the internal tree planting standard beyond the required 10% of BUA, one tree per every 10,000 sq ft of BUA, and the requirement for each parking space to be within 40 ft of a tree; these are all are carried over from current requirements. Staff does not feel there is adequate policy foundation for altering this standard in this draft of the UDO.</p> <p>The Tree Canopy Preservation Program is an established program that could be adjusted through other initiatives like the forthcoming update to the city's Urban Forest Master Plan and tree canopy goal. Programs to be supported by the Canopy Care Fund would likely have significant focus on equitable distribution of tree canopy benefits.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 4 of 5) Article 19: Off-Street Vehicle & Bicycle Parking - Section 2: VEHICLE PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>UDO does a good job in its requirements for bicycle parking, EV charging stations, and EV parking allotments.</p> <p>We want to eliminate most, if not all minimum parking requirements in Tier 3 areas (i.e. the most dense areas like South Park and potentially in University City), and encourage developers to build shared parking or other solutions. The same principle applies in single family and multi-family development.</p> <p>From a wonky metric standpoint staff needs to substantiate their UDO parking matrix by addressing the following questions: How was the 1/250 GFA ratio determined for office facilities? How does this compare with the current zoning ordinance?</p>	<p>The draft UDO does eliminate most minimum parking in Tier 3. Shared parking is supported by the UDO draft. 1/250 GFA does not apply to all tiers. The current parking required for office varies for different zoning districts.</p>	No
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 5 of 5) Is there a way to find out on an item by item basis which parking ratios are different in the UDO draft vs. the current zoning ordinance? The Planning staff needs to explain their rationale for changing such ratios.</p> <p>Should all parking be based on Net Square Footage, rather than Gross? Depending on the building type, as much as 50% of a building could conceivably be storage, elevator shafts, hallways etc. Such functions lie mostly outside the realm of normal, daily parking needs.</p>	<p>This comment is still under review.</p>	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 1 of 2) Topic: Affordable Housing On behalf of the OneMECK Affordable Housing Team, I request that the UDO include provisions that encourage private developers of multi-family rental projects to include units of affordable housing in market developments that do not otherwise receive affordable housing-related federal, state, city or county funding for such units ("Qualifying Projects"). Based upon input we received from private developers, we propose three ways for the UDO to incentivize Qualifying Projects. (1) A Qualifying Project could earn a significant density bonus by including various levels of affordable units (set by City Council from time to time) for people at specified Area Median Income (AMI) levels, with higher density bonuses allowed for units designated for residents at 50% of AMI and below. The density bonus can also be higher for Qualifying Projects that are located in High Opportunity Zones (to be defined as including higher income neighborhoods, good access to employment, and other factors based on principles of equity, as set by the City Council).</p>	<p>The UDO draft includes development bonuses for affordable housing through the voluntary mixed income standards and the height bonus. Additional affordable housing support (though adjustments of certain standards for affordable housing, for example) will be included in the next UDO draft.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>(Part 2 of 2) (2) Various direct costs paid to the City such as application fees, etc. could be waived, and time periods for various approvals (which also result in costs) could be shortened, for Qualifying Projects. (3) The City (and the County, if agreed) could refund, directly or through an intermediary, all or some of the property taxes to be incurred by Qualifying Projects (based on the amount of affordable housing in the project), to be applied as rent subsidies for the low-income residents in order to bring the total rent paid for the affordable units up to a fair market level.</p> <p>As the UDO undergoes review and revision, we ask the City to look for additional opportunities to encourage and enable private developers of market rate developments to include affordable housing that is widely dispersed throughout the City. Despite the efforts of the City and the County, we are losing existing Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing faster than it is being replaced. We believe that our proposals will help address this critical issue.</p>	<p>These approaches are outside of the scope of the UDO but can still be assessed as development process changes. Also, some of these suggestions need legal and fiscal assessment. The comments have been forwarded to the Charlotte Development Center and Housing & Neighborhood Services for consideration.</p>	No
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>I remain concerned about changes to the rules on Driveways . On existing properties already built and recorded we have to deal with what is there. Fire hydrants, catch basins, topography, power poles and guy wires transformers and telephone equipment. Please grandfather existing recorded lots to the existing rules.</p> <p>The cost/benefit of a lot of the tree provisions has not been done.</p>	<p>Updated 04/28/2022: The Driveway and Access Rules will be incorporated as part of the new Charlotte Streets Manual. The Charlotte Streets Manual is referenced in the UDO but is not part of the UDO. The public engagement and feedback process for the Charlotte Streets Manual is being coordinated by the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT).</p> <p>The Tree Canopy Action Plan and UDO Economic Impact Analysis assessed the economic and ecological costs and benefits of these proposed standards.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	<p>Suggestion to add this type of overlay to Article 14. Special Purpose & Overlay Zoning Districts (PBD - Parking Benefit District). It could be used in areas with Tier 3 parking requirements near N1 districts to alleviate the conflict areas that represent the concerns of some of the draft comments posted thus far.</p> <p>Parking Benefit District (PBD) - are defined geographic areas, typically in downtown areas or along commercial corridors in which a majority of the revenue generated from on-street parking facilities (Parking meters, parking permits, or even off-street public parking decks) within the district are returned to the district to finance neighborhood improvements.</p> <p>One KEY part is that funds collected in each district must NOT go into a general fund or be diverted to any other organization. When done right, PBDs build community support b/c funds go back into their neighborhoods, it keeps parking inline b/c parking is never really free, and begins to manage parking for the public good.</p> <p>Articles on PBD: https://why.org/articles/ideas-worth-stealing-parking-benefit-districts/ https://www.sullivansgulch.org/uploads/4/0/9/1/40915355/parking_benefit_districts.pdf https://www.mapc.org/resource-library/parking-benefit-districts/</p>	Updated 4/25/22: This suggestion has been forwarded to CDOT as it is not triggered by development and wouldn't be established by the UDO.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	Global Comments	1.1. Document Usability. A public document like this UDO, created in 2022, should have industry standard basic usability formatting and function built in to any published document. At a minimum, cross-references hyperlinked, Parts, Articles bookmarked and terms that are defined hyperlinked. It is incredibly difficult from a user standpoint to navigate this draft document and it inhibits a clear understanding of the interconnected parts.	Opportunities to improve user readability will be explored in the adopted draft of the UDO.	No (for the next draft)
3/18/2022	Global Comments	The UDO also needs to provide for a more collaborative review process with Charlotte Water, so that water/sewer plans are approved in conjunction with LDP	The development review process occurs through the Charlotte Development Center. The UDO does not include processes in order to allow flexibility in process changes over time.	No