

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/24/2021	30.1 Purpose	<p>Under "Purpose" (30.1-C-1), I'm kind of confused at the wording of the statement. It reads as if the goals will primarily serve economic development which mainly serves business entities, the city, then the citizens. If the city wants its residents (both present and future) to believe they care about them, then I think it's important to come off in a way that signals a priority for residential quality of life, especially if the individual does not have two pennies to rub together. Something like: "Expanded transportation options, each of which should naturally feel safe and intuitive, will serve as a catalyst to an improved quality of life and thus economic development for all." The goal of this sort of wording is to say that, someone can safely get to work even they become physically disabled or they lost their mode of transportation. If they also lost their source of income, then their ability to move around and continue their life shall not be restricted to spaces reserved for cars. I understand that this is a legal document, but should there not be some kind of "up-selling" language to hold feet to the fire?</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 02/10/2022: The current draft language will be revised to address these concerns in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/30/2022: The specific reference is to the network requirements of the subdivision process, so the new draft language retains those elements, while addressing the important ties between the street network and quality of life and equitable mobility.</p>	Yes
12/7/2021	30.1 Purpose	<p>How will development permitting be processed to determining capacity /impacts to: public school air quality stormwater road capacity water/sewer service open space & parks</p> <p>These matters are imperative to comprehensive growth management & whether development is permitting that is compatible the Comprehensive Plan/desired outcome.</p>	<p>Updated 02/10/2022: Staff believes the proposed regulations in the draft UDO address development impacts to the extent currently allowed by state law.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/19/2022	30.1 Purpose	30.1-C: It might make sense to switch bullet points 1. and 2. That way it suggests a higher emphasis on safety varied mode choices. ; 30.1: It would be nice to see more concrete ideas about what kind of changes we're going to make on streets to accommodate other modes of transportation than just cars. This might be something that the policy map or elsewhere, but I'm not sure. An example of what I'm referring to would be that in most Dutch towns they have categories of streets that dictates whether bikes have a protected lane, share space with cars/pedestrians, or aren't allowed (highways etc).	Staff views all of the items under Section 30.1.C to be important. They are not presented, or intended to be taken, in any particular hierarichal order. For recommendations or suggestions on categories of streets it is recommended you engage with the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Strategic Mobility Plan project.	No
11/27/2021	30.2 Applicability	I appreciate the acknowledgement that these standards don't work in the ETJ (Or City NCDOT roads) but this one sentence 491 pages into the document just sets up a Conflict for every ETJ project. CDOT already knows that NCDOT will not accept the Arterial cross sections so why propose them in the ETJ? (I have an NCDOT email to prove it). CDOT should write the CRT/ guidelines to comply with NCDOT not pretend they might comply & leave the property owners in limbo (e.g. Grand Palisades Parkway which is 15+ years trying to get NCDOT to accept the road))	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes
11/27/2021	30.2 Applicability	section 30.2 B acknowledges that Schools are exempt from some standard but omits what should be item D.: that Municipalities can not compel any offsite improvements (See Court of Appeals ruling Buckland v. Town of Haw River 12/29/2000) This applies to Article 33 and CTR Mitigation requirements which are offsite	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified.	No
11/27/2021	31.10 Drainage	31.10 needs to remove the word 'infrastructure'. Not all drainage systems are accomplished through infrastructure. it could be swales, for example	This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO.	Yes
11/27/2021	31.11 No Service Unless Street Accepted or Tentatively Approved	31.11 needs to be corrected. Water and Sewer lines are accepted for maintenance separately for the road (remove from the list). City Council doesn't approve streets - its an Administrative function (delegated)	This language pertains to streets accepted by the city through methods other than by plat. For example, private to public through the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT).	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	31.12 Standards and Specifications	31.12 erosion control is not a minimum standard- i.e. if you don't grade over an acre there would be no requirement by Law or Ordinance for an EC plan.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/30/2022: This confuses the general requirement for soil erosion measures for development with the soil erosion requirement for a required improvement such as a new street. The proposed language is reference to the latter, not the former.	No
11/27/2021	31.12 Standards and Specifications	Merging final plat approval wit street acceptance is confusing. They are two separate steps sometimes years apart. Make into 2 sections.	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity these are two separate process - The 'and' conjunction will be changed to 'or.'	Yes
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 A. 1. NCDOT has not agreed to the Arterial road standards & there are provisions for when an existing road need not be moved that are not referenced here.	Staff believes all the provisions, as referenced, from the current Subdivision Ordinance have been carried forward in the draft UDO.	No
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 B. does not comply with Court case Buckland Vv. Haw River (2000) wherein the City can not compel offsite roadway improvements	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/15/2022: No legal issues have been identified. Staff believes the proposed language falls within the scope of the permissions allowed via Ch. 160D-804.	No
11/27/2021	31.13 Performance Guarantees	31.13 F. needs the words 'where applicable' added to the end of the last sentence. State law does not allow maintenance bonds for all improvements	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 04/01/2022: The referenced clause will be struck in its entirety from the second draft UDO.	Yes
11/12/2021	31.2 Block and Network Design Standards	Cul-de-sac are great for neighborhood. This fosters neighborhood gathering areas and kids to play.	Thank you for this feedback.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	31.3 Types of Subdivisions	Section 31.1 A (the second #1) says NST plats are subject to Article 16.1. NO THEY ARE NOT. You can not require elevated walks or review of structures in easements . the stat law is clear-- when you are NOT SUBJECT TO the ordinance- it means the whole ordinance	This is a number formatting error in the draft and will be corrected in the next draft to ensure not-subject-to plats are exempted.	Yes
1/16/2022	31.3 Types of Subdivisions	32.3.H – Does this mean no circle driveways are allowed now? Circle driveways provide ease of safe access on to busier streets.	The current proposed language limits curb cuts per street frontage to one. It does not specifically prohibit circular driveways.	No
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 A removed the notation about railroad crossing (appears to be moved to page 32-4.) it needs to be in this section for clarity	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 B- when the other side of the half street is owned by someone else (likely)the city can not compel that owner to sell or allow the construction except through condemnation. This section should layout the requirements that the City can require the other half of street be built if the City will condemn. failure to condemn means no half street construction (supported by General statute & case law)	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified. Staff believes the authority of the draft language is enabled by NCGS Ch. 160D-804(a).	No
11/27/2021	31.4 General Requirements	31.4 E - you must remove 'arterial' as a required classification for parallel roads. Or you have to identify the roads you want to prohibit access & pay the property owners for that loss of access rights like NCDOT does.	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified. Further, this feedback confuses NEW subdivision requirements with existing development accommodations.	No
1/19/2022	31.4 General Requirements	A. Residential Street Design - I support avoiding dead-ends and cul-de-sacs, as they are detrimental to having a well-connected street layout. However the "To the greatest extent practicable" language concerns me - sounds like it leaves is a lot of wiggle room.	The current Subdivision Ordinance also has this "wiggle room," except it uses the language "where feasible" rather than the referenced in the draft UDO.	No
11/27/2021	31.6 Preliminary Plan Requirements	31.6 A.. omitted open space (which is not the same thing as greenways) existing public parks, open space, or greenways	UDO-required open space is not an appropriate notation for a preliminary plat submission.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	31.6 Preliminary Plan Requirements	31.6 A. #12 & #14 are information not likely known at time of Preliminary Plat. They also are not necessary for a review of the Preliminary plat	Preliminary plans are "construction documents," not plats. These pieces of information are known at the time these are prepared.	No
11/27/2021	31.7 Final Plat Requirements	31.7 B- again-- why is height and use and location something to show on a plat. There is a building pad area that tells you location (Subject to the odd language on Table 29-2 allowing [staff] to tell you to MOVE a proposed structure) if you have to list land uses then you have to go through the expensive & timely process of preparing & reviewing a revised final plat to change use. Why? you get change of use permits at the County not city. Alternative is to list all allowed uses & that is ridiculous.	These height and use standards exist in the current subdivision ordinance and are being carried forward into the draft UDO. In both instances, height and use can be very much impacted by siting on a parcel and/or adjacency to neighboring/surrounding properties.	No
11/27/2021	31.7 Final Plat Requirements	And what happens overtime when the improvements in a Common Area changes? does that also require a new expensive final plat because they want to add another bench or trash can?	The intent of the language is to verify structures in the common open space meet preliminary plan and zoning requirements. It is not intended to regulate incidental objects such as benches or trash cans.	No
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 B.2. has a general list of things you say you can mandate a reservation of land. No statutory reference is provided. in a presentation to City Council the slide referred to reservation for police stations- listed no where in this UDO.	Facilities such as a police station would be covered by the "other public facility" language of the referenced section.	No
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	provide statutory authority to throw out time lines for a staff-driven review (with reservation)	The referenced language does not throw out timelines. The proposed language expresses, as allowed via Ch. 160D-804, that for reservations wanted by a public authority that subdivision plats will not be approved until such required reservation is shown on a plat application.	No
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 D. - how is an approval of a Final Plat called tentative approval? when is it not tentative? once approved it is usually signed & taken to the Register of Deeds. It is not Tentative	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to remove the word 'tentative' from this language.	Yes
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8 .E. #3. what other agency. Please be specific. Give examples.	This language reflects changes per NCGS Ch. 160D.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	31.8 Procedures for Subdivision Approval	31.8.H. does this section need to change for the DSTAC discussion on Early Grading?	This language is consistent with that discussion.	No
10/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1(D): Add recognition that historic buildings/character could be reasons for exceptions.	Staff believes the current exception language is sufficient. If an existing building is going to remain on the site of a proposed development staff would not require a new road to run through that existing building.	No
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 table 32-1 removed the preferred block length for creek crossings. it needs to be explicitly here	Please see the proposed language at Section 32.1.D.	No
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 B.2.d. iii needs to include the exemption for not requiring stub roads to properties that can not be subdivided (e.g. those with deed restrictions)	This scenario would be addressed by the "existing lots" language per this section.	No
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 C. 3 a. needs to add that roads parallel to adjacent developed uses should not be in the calculation (e.g. you don't stub to a 26 acre school so you end up with a long road);	Please see the proposed language at Section 32.1.A.2.	No
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	drawing on page 32-5 doesn't use the same wording as page 21-11. is it not ca Buffer Landscape yard?	This will be amended in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 G. needs to also be subject to the Exceptions in section D on previous page. . Exceptions (D) should be the last in the alphabetical list.	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes
11/27/2021	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 H - Half street construction needs to spell out that if the City won't condemn then the City can't mandate the construction;	In this scenario the required new right-of-way is on the developing tract.	No
1/19/2022	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	B. 2. Block Length - Many of the maximum average block lengths listed in Table 32-2 are too long to create places that encourage walking. The typical block length in our most walkable existing neighborhoods (Uptown, South End, Plaza Midwood) is 400', and rarely more than 500'. The maximum lengths in Table 32-2 should be replaced with the lengths in Table 32-1	Block lengths are calculated using the preferred lengths listed in Table 32-1. Based on site conditions flexibility is provided for by Table 32-2 and exceptions listed in the draft UDO. Many of the block length numbers are comparable to the requirements found in the current Subdivision Ordinance.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/20/2022	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	Cul de Sacs should be banned. Creating a network of streets that promote more options for getting around should be of the up most importance.	Staff has put forth proposed language that emphasizes that cul-de-sacs should be avoided and utilized only as an alternative of last resort.	No
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. Cross access removes buffers & should specifically say that no buffer / landscape planting are required.	This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO.	Yes
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. 2 needs to specifically exempt One- and Two-Family Homes.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 02/28/2022: Staff believes that the current draft UDO language exempts these uses.	No
11/27/2021	32.2 Cross-Access	32.2 A. 5. needs to provide for the likely occurrence that the adjacent owner doesn't want the cross access & won't sign anything	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified.	No
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3. A. The CSManual requires driveways to be 10' from the property line- if on an Arterial which is impossible. Visualize Scaleybark & tell me how it works. You want attached housing but you can't get driveways 10' from the property line.	This comment will be forwarded to CDOT for consideration in the CSManual which, while related, is not part of the UDO. Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CDOT.	No
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	Driveway permits need to be part of the Preliminary Plan approval. not a different approval step	Driveway approval is part of the plan approval process. More details are provided in the Charlotte Streets Manual.	No
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3 B. c. Because storm drainage inlets are on the property line (when they run between lots) the wording needs to better define ' conflict with or negatively impact'	Staff believes that other portions of the UDO address this, including 32.2.B.1.c and 24.3.A.2.	No
11/27/2021	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	32.3 B.1. e. says 200' and 32.3 B 2 b says 150' . Which is it?. What if it's 160' ?	Staff will make driveway locations and access restriction spacing consistent at 200'.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/19/2022	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	<p>G. Cul-de-sacs and Dead-End Streets</p> <p>2. This is too long - cul-de-sacs hurt walkability and have a very high per-user construction and upkeep costs. When absolutely necessary, they should be kept as short as possible. I suggest they should be kept to no more than half the normal preferred street spacing.</p> <p>3. I am a huge fan of this provision - having pedestrian and bike access is vital even when vehicle connection is impractical.</p> <p>3. c. This part is concerning - what constitutes a significant topographical condition? For example, what about a creek? A pedestrian/bike bridge should still be required in cases like that.</p> <p>4. Excellent - honestly we would be better off banning dead ends and cul-de-sacs city-wide in all place types</p>	<p>Cul-de-sacs offer a useful tool to help the city utilize some pieces of land for development. Shortening these lengths would potentially remove development opportunities.</p> <p>As written, the proposed language states "...unusual topography exists which prevents connection..." Therein is the standard - Topography preventing a connection. Further, the example of a creek would be expressly covered as a "natural barrier such as a waterway" thereby preventing connection.</p>	No
1/19/2022	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	<p>I. Traffic Calming -</p> <p>Why not require traffic calming on most (if not all) streets, not just those that exceed maximum block length? Drivers don't just speed on longer streets.</p> <p>I believe there should be many more traffic calming requirements in this document - currently most of our streets are very dangerous, and its mainly due to drivers going too fast. Clearly speed limit signs alone aren't working, and traffic calming is the only effective way to make cars stay below the speed limit.</p>	<p>Many design elements are intended to support traffic calming as the UDO is implemented. The block lengths and street designs are intended, in part, to help with calming, due to shorter blocks, more intersections, on-street parking where appropriate, and street trees.</p>	No
1/19/2022	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	<p>32.3 B. 1. h. I support this - excess driveways create unnecessary dangerous conflict points, especially for pedestrians and bikes</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback.</p>	No
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	<p>33.5 C.3 d. where are the MTC Transit Service Guidelines (not in the supporting documents)</p>	<p>A link to the MTC page of the Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) website is available on the Supporting Documents page of the UDO web site (https://publicinput.com/cltudo_supportingdocuments). Work on transit service guidelines is ongoing.</p>	No
1/19/2022	32.3 Driveways and Street Access	<p>32.3 H. I support this - the less curb-cuts the better!</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.1 Transportation Impact Study (TIS)	You call 33.1 a TIS but the Draft calls it CTR. which is in error?	CTR is correct. This will be clarified in the next UDO draft.	Yes
11/27/2021	33.1 Transportation Impact Study (TIS), 33.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	33.1B and 33.2.B use word Threshold but the CTR calls them Tiers. Be consistent. Threshold is better are there are other items called tiers in the UDO	The UDO refers to thresholds. The CTR does apply a threshold, with tiers to further differentiate the requirements (similar to tiers of parking in the UDO).	No
11/27/2021	33.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	33.2 E. 2. sets the limit for a Collector Road at 1 dua since ii and iii would never be reached (given that the sentence structure says 'or') Collector roads should not be that prevalent. Local streets lower vehicular speeds.	Staff believes the language, as written and currently implemented, is sufficiently flexible to identify collectors when they are needed.	No
1/19/2022	33.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	33.2 I support this requirement! The solution to traffic is not more car infrastructure, but less cars.	Thank you for this feedback.	No
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 B.1. e violates state law when it requires improvement of a Bus Stop Amenity on the other side of the right-of-way	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified.	No
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 shifting the burden for an entire CATS system upgrade & expansion to those who don't live here yet is awful. Why do transit riders pay fares? Why do we pay property taxes?. If it's important than the riders & citizenry should pay for it.	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific recommendations for revisions, we invite you to input them in the comment portal.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 C. 1. a. i. the MCT adopted Transit Service plans needs to be available for review (it is NOT on the supporting document page)	A link to the transit planning page of the Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) website is available on the Supporting Documents page of the UDO web site (https://publicinput.com/cltudo_supportingdocuments). Work on transit service plans is ongoing.	No
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5 C. 11. a. ii. the threshold of 300 trips is a fraction of the # of trips it would take to actually develop a new rider. 3000 trips is more appropriate. similarly 33.5 C 2.b. i. - the requirement for 2 new bus stops with 2500 traffic count is too much of a stretch. that few traffic count will not generate the people to use that many bus shelters.	Staff will adjust the 300 and 2,500 trip thresholds to align with Comprehensive Transportation Review guidelines. Staff will also amend language regarding bus stops and amenities to take into consideration adjacency of existing stops and amenities in the vicinity of a site where the requirement for a new stop and amenities has been triggered.	Yes
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	33.5.C. 2.c. the spacing of 1/4 mile (1320 ft) is too close. the traffic back up with a bus stopping every quarter of a mile will be a disaster	Staff has examples of current bus stop spacing and works, as appropriate, to take into consideration adjacency of existing stops and amenities in the vicinity of a site where the requirement for a new stop and amenities has been triggered.	No
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	where are the CATS Bus Stop Special Details?	<p>Staff will also amend language regarding bus stops and amenities to take into consideration adjacency of existing stops and amenities in the vicinity of a site where the requirement for a new stop and amenities has been triggered.</p> <p>Updated 04/15/2022: With apologies, the previous update is incorrect for this comment.</p> <p>To clarify - The CATS Bus Stop Special Details are located at https://charlottenc.gov/ld/CLDSM/Documents/Revised%20CATS%20Details.pdf</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	Does NCDOT allow bus stops / stopping buses every 1/4 mile?	Staff has examples of current bus stop spacing on state roads and works with NCDOT if amenities such as shelters are required.	No
1/20/2022	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements	Section 33.5 - overhead protection/bus shelters should be required for all new bus stops constructed. Many bus stops are merely a sign next to the sidewalk that offers no protection from the elements while waiting. This would be a minimal added expense to developers but make a huge impact on rider experience.	The proposed language in the draft UDO does not regulate the design of bus stops and amenities required by development. Those requirements are found within the CATS Bus Stop Special Details. This comment will be forwarded to CATS for their consideration. Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CATS.	No
1/21/2022	33.5 Bus Stop and Amenity Requirements; 33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	Bus stops should be required to be updated to full covered structures with seating. New development should be required to install protected and separated (raised concrete, not plastic bollards or paint) bike lanes to help build out a better and safer bike network.	The proposed language in the draft UDO does not regulate the design of bus stops and amenities required by development. Those requirements are found within the CATS Bus Stop Special Details. This comment will be forwarded to CATS for their consideration. Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CATS.	No
11/12/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	Residential Narrow is not in the Draft UDO, this is an important street type in small residential neighborhood.; 8' planting strips are too wide. This increases the width of the ROW. This is another land taking.	Staff disagrees. Residential Narrow street types have been underutilized and misapplied when proposed for development. Eight foot planting strips are the current standard for residential Narrow street types - This has not increased. There are also challenges in ensuring adequate public service with this street type.	No
11/27/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	33.6 C. requiring reservation of all Arterials (FKA Minor thoroughfares) is a serious property taking - especially for housing of any format. For every mile or road it's a taking of an additional 4.36 acres- off the tax rolls and not available for the density the 2040 Plan envisioned	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/30/2022: No legal issues have been identified.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.6 Required New Streets	33.6 A- construction of a new road for a building permit is excessive. #2 needs to be deleted	Updated 02/10/2022: The draft UDO includes proposed modifications and adjustments to ensure requirements are proportional. An example of this flexibility can be found in Section 33.3. A key component of this requirement is a proposed development site must be of the size that would trigger the requirement for a street.	No
11/27/2021	33.7 Required Off-Street Public Paths	33.7 E. where is the detail for the width & construction standards for these off street paths. Item 4 leaves it open ended & it should not be. What are the accommodations needed for the extra tree clearing.	Article 34 describes the design requirements for these connections. The intent of item 4 is to ensure the necessary flexibility for development to potentially pair other access requirements with this. Paths can meander to avoid significant stands of trees or heritage trees.	No
10/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8(B)(2)(b)(iv): This is a significant disincentive to adding outdoor dining to historic buildings.	Updated 02/17/2022: Staff believes the proposed language in the draft UDO ensures appropriate infrastructure depending on scale and context for changes including for outdoor dining.	No
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 A. 1. The CTR can not require offsite improvement. it can not require road improvements for a NST plat. It should not require improvements on roads in the ETJ	This comment will be forwarded to CDOT for consideration as part of the CTR process. Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CDOT.	No
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8A.1.e will dissuade people from doing reuse of existing (sometimes abandoned) big box centers. why make it harder when we want the services in these older neighborhoods?	Changes of use within a use category, for example from commercial retail (big box) to another commercial retail (neighborhood services), would not trigger these improvements in most cases.	No
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8A.2. Exemptions- makes no sense. is it the addition of 25% new BUA, or the total site has >25% BUA. Please re-write	Per Sec. 33.8.A.2.a it is the cumulative built upon area of less than 25% for the total area of the parcel.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 B 2.c. NCDOT has lots of complaints about the odd extra lane being used for tractor trailer parking. #c should be rewritten to NOT require the lane in NCDOT roads unless requested by NCDOT	Staff will review this comment with NCDOT to determine whether changes are recommended. Updated 02/28/2022: The UDO draft includes language requiring coordination with NCDOT on NCDOT roadways.	No
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8. 3 (relocation) is way too much of an overreach. Add to your home and you move the curb & storm drainage. WOW. Take a building upfit permit on an old commercial center & move the curb & piping which causes the loss of a row of parking spots, that's awful. this whole section needs to be revisited and toned down.	Staff feels the proposed language is appropriate and the improvements mentioned would not trigger the requirement to move the curb. Single family homes are expressly exempt and a commercial upfit would not trigger the requirements.	No
11/27/2021	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	why on 33-8-A 1 do i have to move the ditch line back with associated piping & Curb (on NCDOT street) but if its existing (Section 33-8 3.3 ii A (page 33-10)	Updated 02/28/2022: The UDO draft includes language requiring coordination with NCDOT on NCDOT roadways.	No
1/19/2022	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 B. 2. I support these provisions - sidewalks and shared-use paths are very important and should be updated to standard whenever possible	Thank you for this feedback.	No
1/19/2022	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	33.8 B. 4. Shared-use paths or sidewalks should always be required, even when space is constrained. If the space is constrained, they should use all the space available. Pedestrians and cyclists still have to travel there whether a paved surface is provided or not.	Thank you for this feedback.	No
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	section 3 on page 33-9 conflicts with section 39.3 non-conforming structures	Staff does not understand this comment. Please provide additional information.	No
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	bottom of page 33-10 - is the city really going to prohibit on-street parking on collector & local roads? How	This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. However, in some cases the city may prohibit on-street parking when the street width is inadequate.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	item B. 1 on page 33-11 needs a drawing to make this section clear.	Please provide additional information on which aspect of Sec. 33.B.1 would benefit most from an illustration.	No
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	page 33-14 item 1.d. 'documented and confirmed' site constraints? how? and why only transmission structures? what about electrical distribution structures?? what about other Utility constraints? Why only power?	The "documented and confirmed" language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. Staff believes the scale and scope of high voltage transmission structures are significant enough to prevent relocation of curb and gutter.	Yes
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	there is not enough nexus for the building of a bank to require the entire private road network of the larger Activity Center to be #2 page 33-12 rebuilt. Limit the improvements to onsite & proportional	This issue is addressed by the transportation adjustments language of Sec. 33.3 of the draft UDO.	No
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	table 33-3 in areas <10' >8' are trees not allowed in the 'remaining space'?	The remaining space in this scenario is not adequate room for tree planting.	No
11/27/2021	33.9 Existing Unimproved Rights-of-Way	page 33-14 item c above table 33-4. Why would there ever be an improvement required for an Existing Building. ; items d and e below table 33-4 highlight how you can write a sentence acknowledging 3+ conflicting goals but not solve the problem. Yove made us build a sea of impervious pavement, but you know the trees have to be planted. And you've ignored you killed other trees when the additional impervious requires an increased storm water basin.	Updated 02/17/2022: Staff believes the proposed language in the draft UDO provides needed guidance on constrained space conditions.	No
10/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	Table 34-4: wider sidewalks are not always better, particularly when combined with curb and gutters, 11' drive lanes, setbacks, amenity zones, etc.	Staff believes the sidewalk widths are appropriate for the designated contexts indicated in the table.	No
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	34.3 A days dimensions but the table has no dimensions	This language explains the table provides a reference point for the dimensions, not the actual dimensions.	No
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	table 34-2 why is Collector road omitted?	This table refers to local street types.	No
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	table 34-3 the 8' amenity zone needs to be centered in the row if it applies to a// street classifications	This change will be implemented.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	note #4 & % below table 34-3 conflicts with page 29-9 (trees 10' from utilities). Either or both need additional clarity	It appears this comment references note #5 and staff will reexamine this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/30/2022: Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes
11/27/2021	34.3 Street Design	page 34-4 references a Transit Trail Plan. Where is it? not on supporting document page	No transit trail plans currently exist.	No
11/27/2021	34.4 Off-Street Public Paths	34.4 B & C. it is assumed the connection is a property width not the pavement width. Provide clarity	Staff does not understand this comment. Please provide additional information.	No
1/19/2022	34.4 Off-Street Public Paths	34.4 B. I support the 10' path width requirement, that is a good minimum width to allow for pedestrians and bikes to share the space.	Thank you for this feedback.	No
1/20/2022	34.4 Off-Street Public Paths	34.4 C. The 5' or 4' area abutting the path should be less restricted. Under the current language, things like planters, flower beds, small trees, and benches could be considered "obstacles" but should be allowed to make space more appealing than just empty grass	Updated 02/17/2022: This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO for how such items and the space abutting the path are treated. Updated 03/11/2022: This language will be modified to allow some of the highlighted uses within the area abutting the path. Updated 03/30/2022: The updated draft language will ensure that the width of the path is safe and context-appropriate, but with fewer restrictions to items that can be close to the edge of the path for comfort, such as benches and trees.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	34.5 Cross-Access	34.C 1.a.Are trees considered obstacles when adjacent to a ped/bike connection? If so that is an extra acre of grading every 8/10's of an acres. What is the value in that extra 10' of clearing?	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 02/17/2022: This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO for how such items and the space abutting the path are treated.</p> <p>Updated 03/11/2022: This language will be modified to allow some of the highlighted uses within the area abutting the path.</p> <p>Updated 03/30/2022: The updated draft language will ensure that the width of the path is safe and context-appropriate, but with fewer restrictions to items that can be close to the edge of the path for comfort, such as benches and trees.</p>	Yes
11/27/2021	35.1 Drainage	35.1 storm drainage is not always 'installed'. maybe 'constructed' is a better word .	This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
12/29/2021	35.2 Water Supply; 35.3 Wastewater Sewer	<p>(Part 1 of 2) Hello, my name is James Kissmer. My family operates a business focused on development of infill lots, typically small lots that once had a house on them. I noticed the current proposed UDO does not speak to Water and Sewer development fees. I'd like to recommend they be included, as these fees, though available to be found on the Charlotte Water site, could use to be more transparent and hosted in the primary UDO document.</p> <p>I'd also like to recommend these fees be adjusted to a sliding scale based on square footage of the dwelling. My understanding is that a major goal of the UDO is to address the rapidly developing housing crisis in our city. A standard connection/development fee of \$11,617 (currently) is simply too high to spur the development of small, affordable houses (<1,000 sqft), and too low to account for the disproportionate water and sewer usage of large, unaffordable houses (>3,000sqft), the development of which surely will not alleviate the crisis we find our city in.</p>	<p>Development fees are not addressed in the draft UDO. However, these comments have been forwarded to Charlotte Water for consideration.</p> <p>Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CLTWTR.</p>	No
12/29/2021	35.2 Water Supply; 35.3 Wastewater Sewer	<p>(Part 2 of 2) My family's business is not adversely affected by the current development fees from an economic perspective, but rather from a moral perspective. There are dozens of lots in dozens of historically discriminated-against neighborhoods that could have small, affordable houses built on them. But instead they sit vacant, overgrown, because no 850sqft house is economically feasible, and no 3,500sqft house will fit on a 50x150 lot. Please consider a reduced fee, even a waived fee, for smaller houses, and please consider an increased fee for large houses that continue to make Charlotte unaffordable for the low and middle-class.</p> <p>All the best, James</p>	<p>Development fees are not addressed in the draft UDO. However, these comments have been forwarded to Charlotte Water for consideration.</p> <p>Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CLTWTR.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/2/2022	33.6 Required New Streets; 33.7 Required Off-Street Public Paths; 33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	<p>Maybe I missed it or it's covered in a different part of the UDO, but there's nothing about requiring bike lanes in these sections (33.6, 33.7, and 33.8) and it seems like it should be. Maybe this is something covered by the Charlotte Streets Map and not the UDO, but maybe a reference to that would be helpful for those reading through.</p> <p>I would like to see something akin to what Raleigh has implemented with this ordinance (https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR22/TC-03-21-ORD.pdf).</p>	Article 33 includes the requirements for new streets or improvements to existing streets. Article 34 specifies design requirements and references the Streets Map for Arterial cross-sections, which include the bicycle facilities.	No
2/2/2022	34.2 Charlotte Streets Map; 34.3 Street Design	<p>Maybe I missed it or it's covered in a different part of the UDO, but there's nothing about requiring bike lanes in this article and it seems like it should be either here or in article 33. Maybe this is something covered by the Charlotte Streets Map and not the UDO, but maybe a reference to that would be helpful for those reading through.</p> <p>I would like to see something akin to what Raleigh has implemented with this ordinance (https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR22/TC-03-21-ORD.pdf).</p> <p>Separated infrastructure is preferred. A bike gutter will not encourage many people to start to use bikes for transportation.</p>	See above for response to first portion of the comment. In response to the final portion of the comment: The Streets Map incorporates several types of bicycle facilities, including separated facilities where street and land use context supports them. Where recommended, a standard (5') bike lane is exclusive of (2') gutter pan.	No
3/11/2022	33.7 Required Off-Street Public Paths	Article 33.7 and Article 34.4 appear to be duplicates, but they could be perceived as 2 separate and distinct requirements. Please remove one Article if you mean ONE connection	Section 33.7 includes information about the REQUIREMENT for the paths, while Section 34.4 describes the DESIGN STANDARDS for the paths.	No
3/11/2022	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	Article 32 has applicability for all 'land development projects' but that term is not defined. <i>Land</i> Development implies Horizontal improvements but it is not clear given the hodge-podge of applicability in the draft UDO.	Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to provide clarity.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/11/2022	33.1 Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR)	Article 33.1B and 33.2B does not exempt redevelopment or change of use, so as written the repair from fire damage to a 300 unit stacked Multi-family would necessitate a CTR and a TDM and all of the associated improvements to the City street system for no additional transportation demand necessitating the hiring of several engineers and payment of fees to the City unnecessarily. The CTR says Net New trips but the requirements for the CTR / TDM (page 33-1) needs to correctly reflect that there are 'development projects' (an undefined term) that are exempt. Would be helpful to define development as Land Development	Sections 39.2.G and 39.3.G allow replacement for nonconforming uses and structures, respectively, due to fire, flood, etc. CTR, while referenced in the UDO, is not PART of the UDO. The Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) has informed staff that since CTR uses net NEW trips, a simple 1:1 replacement of an existing development would not trigger a CTR.	No
3/11/2022	33.8 Improvements to Existing Streets	The requirements for (A) installation of Curb/gutter (page 33-8); (B) and the relocation & improvement to curb, drainage, sidewalks & planting strips with an addition as small as 500sf (which likely result in a loss of parking spots) (page 33-9 to 33-12 and pages 34-3 &4); (C) and the requirements for bus stop amenities upgrades or additions (page 33-3); (D) and the TDM requirements for properties with as few as 100 peak hour trips or 350 daily trips (CTR page 2); (E) and the requirement for off-street public paths (page 33-7) all appear to be a uncompensated taking of property not proportionate with the impact thresholds. Given the Supreme Court rulings on such matters, please justify the nexus or revise the improvements to be proportionate.	The items referenced include modification language and are also subect to Section 33.3 - Transportation Adjustements, which is included specifically to address proportionality.	No
3/11/2022	34.3 Street Design	Tables 34-3 and 34-4 on page 34-3 ignore the constraints of sidewalks and planting strips on a bridge. Please provided exemptions.	It is unlikely that the triggers would require improvements to an existing bridge but, if they did, staff believes there is sufficient language to provide needed modifications to either the streetscape requirement or design. For new bridges, the current standards in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual (CLDSM) apply.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/17/2022	32.2 Cross-Access	Article 32. Network, Cross-Access, & Driveway Regulations 32.2 CROSS-ACCESS: Suggestion: Make it easier to use the existing alleyway right-of-way to provide cross-access.	Staff feels that there is sufficient flexibility built into the draft language to allow for this, absent more information about the specific concern.	No
3/18/2022	32.1 Block and Network Design Standards	32.1 BLOCK AND NETWORK DESIGN STANDARDS o32.1.D. Allowance should be stated to permit a multi-use path (pedestrian and bicycle connection) in lieu of an exception granted in this section to meet connectivity standards. This is particularly important where existing public or private greenways and trail networks are existing, like in URP.	Staff feels that both the draft language, and implementation of the language, allows for this.	No